DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 643 UD 022 543

AUTHOR Dunbar, Louise H.
TITLE The Utilization of Values Clarification in Multicultural Education as a Strategy to Reduce Prejudicial Attitudes of Eighth Grade Students.
PUB DATE May 80
NOTE 129p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, Northern Arizona University.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Discrimination; Cultural Awareness; Curriculum Development; Disabilities; *Ethnic Bias; Ethnic Groups; Females; Grade 8; Inservice Teacher Education; Junior High Schools; Males; Multicultural Education; Older Adults; *Racial Bias; *School Attitudes; Self Concept; *Social Bias; *Student Attitudes; Teaching Methods; *Values Clarification
IDENTIFIERS Poway Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the impact of values clarification in multicultural education as a teaching strategy to reduce racial and ethnic bias and prejudices against older people, women, and the handicapped among eighth graders at the Meadowbrook Middle School, Poway Unified School District, California. The study also examined students' general attitudes toward school. Before the workshop, social science teachers participated in a workshop on developing and implementing multicultural education units and teaching strategies. An assessment survey of students' multicultural attitudes was administered to the Meadowbrook subjects and to a control group, before and after the values clarification program. Results indicated that the values clarification strategy, as the experimental "treatment," did not significantly reduce students' racial/ethnic prejudices or alter their attitudes toward school, although it improved students' ability to clarify their own attitudes and perceptions toward other ethnic groups. Initially positive attitudes toward the elderly, women, and the handicapped remained unchanged after the treatment. Male and female differences in attitudes and values were attributed to differences that existed before the treatment. No differences in attitude changes were found among the ethnic groups in the sample. (MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE UTILIZATION OF VALUES CLARIFICATION IN MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AS A STRATEGY TO REDUCE PREJUDICIAL ATTITUDES OF EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Dissertation
Presented to the Graduate Faculty
Northern Arizona University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Louise Hall Dunbar
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by
Louise H. Dunbar
May 1980

UD022543

THE UTILIZATION OF VALUES CLARIFICATION IN MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AS A STRATEGY TO REDUCE PREJUDICIAL ATTITUDES OF EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS

A Dissertation
In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by

Louise H. Dunbar

Approved:

Katherine L. Nutt

Raymond E. Nutt

Joseph R. Ryan

Lyle E. Mullens

L. D. Jones

Date: May 13, 1980

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of a work such as this dissertation is never possible without the advice, counsel, and assistance of a great many people. I especially wish to thank the following persons.

For their very significant roles in the preparation and writing of this study: Dr. Jim R. Davis, Chairman of my Committee; Drs. Raymond E. Huitt, Joseph F. Ryan, Lyle Mullens, and Katherine F. Nutt, Members of my Committee; Dr. Daniel Watson; Dr. John Browne; Mr. Don Hurst, Principal of Meadowbrook Middle School; and the eighth grade social studies students and teachers involved in my study.

I would also like to thank Olivia M. de Roziere for her untiring efforts in typing this dissertation.

Most of all, I would like to thank my family: my husband, Eddie; my daughter, Karla Rene; and Donald, Jr. whose trials were almost more than my own. I wish to extend a special thank-you for their love and patience which made this project worthwhile.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION.	1
	THE PROBLEM	3
	Statement of the Problem	3
	RATIONALE AND IMPORTANCE OF STUDY	4
	ASSUMPTIONS	7
	DEFINITION OF TERMS	7
	CLARIFICATION OF TERMS.	9
	LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.	9
	OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	9
2.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	11
	Multicultural Education as a Teaching Strategy	11
	PREJUDICE IN THE CLASSROOM.	13
	VALUES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO BEHAVIOR . . .	29
	VALUING PROCESS AND VALUE CLARIFICATION PROGRAMS.	34
3.	RESEARCH PROCEDURES	43
	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.	43
	HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED	43
	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.	44
	THE POPULATION.	45
	Experimental Group	46
	Control Group.	46
	PILOT STUDY: "MEETSS-MULTIETHNIC EDUCATION ENRICHES THE SOCIAL SCIENCES"	46
	Program Description.	46

Chapter Page

Objectives of the MEETSS Program. 47

Background Information. 48

MULTICULTURAL STUDENT SURVEY 49

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE. 52

4. ANALYSIS OF DATA 55

Hypothesis One. 56

Hypothesis Two. 59

Hypothesis Three. 61

Hypothesis Four 63

Hypothesis Five 65

Hypothesis Six. 69

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 72

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS. 74

Hypothesis One. 74

Hypothesis Two. 75

Hypothesis Three. 76

Hypothesis Four 76

Hypothesis Five 76

Hypothesis Six. 77

CONCLUSIONS. 77

DISCUSSION 79

RECOMMENDATIONS. 81

REFERENCES CITED. 85

APPENDIXES. 95

A. MULTICULTURAL STUDENT SURVEY 95

Chapter Page

B. RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR THE MULTICULTURAL STUDENT SURVEY. 103

C. MULTICULTURAL OBJECTIVES. 105

D. PILOT STUDY: "MEETSS - MULTIETHNIC EDUCATION ENRICHES THE SOCIAL SCIENCES" 109

E. TREATMENT 116

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Research Design.	46
2.	Mean Scores for Items Tested in Hypothesis One.	57
3.	Items from Hypothesis One with Significant Pre-Post Scores.	58
4.	Mean Scores for Items Tested in Hypothesis Two.	60
5.	Mean Scores for Items Tested in Hypothesis Three.	63
6.	Mean Scores for Items Tested in Hypothesis Four	64
7.	Analysis of Variance for Males' and Females' Total Score.	66
8.	Significant Pretest Questions for Males and Females.	67
9.	Significant Pretest Differences in Total Test and the Four Hypotheses	68
10.	Analysis of Variance for Ethnic Groups as Pre- and Posttests	70
11.	Mean Scores on the Pre- and Posttest for the Seven Ethnic Groups.	71

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Society has several goals and objectives. One of these major goals is the education of its young people through the school system. Within the last decade, a large number of school districts throughout the United States have experienced cultural conflict among students and between students and teachers. As a result, some educational leaders are now making systematic efforts to help teachers and students develop a greater awareness of and respect for cultural differences (Washburn). In addition, the civil rights legislation since 1964 and the education legislation since 1965, (Public Law 88-352) passed by the United States Congress, is a mandate for educators to provide experiences which will help students develop skills for effective interpersonal functioning with culturally diverse people. Such skills will enable students to interact on an egalitarian basis with people culturally different from themselves. Students will also be able to communicate, without restriction or fear, with persons different from themselves in values, lifestyle, appearance, language, religion, or racial background. Thus, it is essential that learning environments reflect efforts to respect the cultural autonomy of all persons if students are to develop respect for and comfort with the cultural differences in others.

However, Clark (1970), Katz (1971:105-112), and Silberman (1970) provide analyses documenting the continued presence of cultural and class bias in instructional practices. This condition is the antithesis of providing experiences which prepare students for living in a pluralistic society where there is recognition and respect for a diversity of cultural expressions.

Many teachers do not engage in instructional practices which challenge myths and misconceptions about Blacks, poor people, or other groups who are "culturally different" from the White middle class. Howe (1971:5847), Ryst (1970), and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1973) characterize instructional practice in relation to Black or Hispanic students as often lacking expressions of praise, enthusiasm, approval, encouragement, and high expectations. Banks (1970:4-9; 1969:954) asserts that curricula and classroom learning opportunities often minimize the contributions of Black and other ethnic groups through omission, distortion, myths, or rationalizations.

One major task of social studies teachers, regardless of the cultural and racial makeup of their student population, should be to create learning conditions which will provide students with knowledge about cultural differences. They should help students develop interpersonal skills which they can use with individuals whom they perceive as different from themselves.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this research investigation is to determine the impact of values clarification strategy as a teaching methodology to reduce prejudicial attitudes of eighth grade students.

In order to analyze this problem, the following hypotheses will be tested:

Hypothesis 1. There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in the reduction of racial prejudices.

Hypothesis 2. There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in the students' ability to clarify and analyze their own personal feelings, attitudes, and perceptions toward their own and other ethnic groups.

Hypothesis 3. There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in personal prejudices of students against

1. older persons
2. women
3. handicapped persons

Hypothesis 4. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in their general attitude toward school.

Hypothesis 5. There will be no significant difference between males and females in their total attitudes on racial bias, on personal prejudices, on their ability to clarify their own values, and on their general attitude toward school.

Hypothesis 6. There will be no significant difference between the eight ethnic groups on their total attitude toward racial bias, toward personal prejudices, in their ability to clarify their own values, and on their general attitude toward school.

RATIONALE AND IMPORTANCE OF STUDY

This research investigation concerns itself with values clarification when used as a multicultural education teaching strategy for the reduction of prejudice in the eighth grade social studies curriculum.

There is evidence that some reduction of prejudice would be the product of more effective general education, especially if the schools could find a way to make up for the disparity in the educational input provided by home

environments and carried over into school environments.

Dent (XXVI:167) concluded that:

> . . . despite the fact that social science has been attacking racism for thirty-five years, many Americans still harbor and cultivate racist attitudes and transmit these attitudes through such socialization practices as child rearing.

Dent (XXVI:168) further states:

> With regard to the educational implications, what is obvious is that any given curriculum in the American educational system is a direct reflection of societal values--and has the obligation of transmitting those values.

The social studies program for all schools should project the image of a pluralistic society. Curriculums which deal with student's attitudes for different ethnic groups should start in preschool and continue through the university levels.

In November, 1972, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Board of Directors (AACTE, 1974:1) released the following statement:

> Multicultural education is education which values cultural pluralism. . . .
>
> Education for cultural pluralism includes four major thrusts: (1) the teaching of values which support cultural diversity and individual happiness; (2) the encouragement of the qualitative expansion of existing ethnic cultures and their incorporation into the mainstream of American socio-economic and political life; (3) the support of explorations in alternative and emerging lifestyles; and (4) the encouragement of multiculturalism, multilingualism, and multidialectism. . . .

A multicultural curriculum identifies the various culture groups in American society and aids in developing a

respect for their historical significance, their folklore, personalities, food, religion, customs, literature, music, language, home structure, art, and mode of dressing. Similarities as well as differences need to be discussed so that students learn to understand and appreciate the uniqueness of each ethnic group. Much of America's racial prejudice and tension has resulted from fear and ignorance about people from different ancestries.

The multicultural education goal must project the belief that differences should be seen as sources of strength rather than weakness. These include the wealth that comes from a variety of languages, religions, lifestyles, industrial and agricultural skills, foods, dress, and folk arts.

The massive, nationwide desegregation of school that followed the 1954 Supreme Court decision outlawing de jure segregation of public schools has made ethnic prejudice among school children an urgent social concern.

There is much research to support the belief that attitudes can be changed when either new, conflicting, or additional information leads to cognitive inconsistencies and motivates the individual to reduce the inconsistency and reestablish equilibrium (Dent XXVI:168). Dent (XXVI:168) reports a significant relationship between prejudice and method of instruction. He asserts certain teaching techniques will reduce prejudice. The intent of this study is

to substantiate the theory that there is a significant relationship between reduction of prejudicial attitudes of students when values clarification is utilized as a method of instruction.

ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions have been made in this study with regard to social studies teachers, students, schools, values, and the social studies curriculum:

1. Teachers consciously and/or unconsciously affect the values of their students.
2. Many students bring to school various degrees of racial prejudice that are often consciously and/or unconsciously reinforced by the school's curriculum.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

In order that the reader may readily understand the language and interpret the data in this study, definitions of some frequently used terms are presented.

Multicultural Education. Wilson Riles (1975:1), Superintendent of Education for the state of California, issued the following definition for multicultural education in an open letter to all California school districts:

> Multicultural education is an educational process which ensures the development of human dignity and respect for the diversity of peoples. In this process, it is essential that differences are not simply tolerated, but that they are understood and accepted.

> Within this definition lies the concepts embraced by cultural pluralism, bilingual education, cross-cultural education, ethnic and intercultural studies, intergroup and human relations. Each is perceived as necessary components of a comprehensive multicultural education program, but none alone can satisfy the requirements of a multicultural education program. Multicultural education, then, is an interdisciplinary educational process rather than a single program.

Prejudice. A feeling and/or attitude of hostility (dislike, fear, anxiety, etc.) against or preference for another individual or group because of sex and/or race, or national, ethnic, or religious characteristics (Leviatin, 1971).

Discrimination. An overt or covert action against an individual or group because of racial, national, ethnic, or religious differences: for example, barring a person from employment, education, housing; insulting a person; physically attacking a person (Leviatin, 1971).

Curriculum. All the experience which is offered to learners under the auspices or direction of the school (Doll, 1974).

Values. Those elements within a culture to which individuals and groups attach a high worth. Values, like attitudes and beliefs, are learned from the groups in which the individual is socialized. . . (Banks, 1975).

Values. A conception, explicit, or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action (Davis, 1976:20).

CLARIFICATION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this research, the following terms may be interchanged for the terms multicultural education: cultural pluralism, ethnic pluralism, multiethnic education, cultural interrelations education, intercultural relations education, intergroup relations education, and cross-cultural education.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The effect of testing may cause students to answer what is socially approved in their desire to please the instructor.

2. The amount of time that the values clarification instructor spent with the students is a decisive factor.

3. The amount of time students spent on the values clarification activities is a serious consideration.

4. A delayed posttest may have shown different results regarding the effects of the treatment on students.

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The statement of the problem, the rationale for the study, the assumptions, definition of terms, and limitations of the study are described and explained in Chapter 1.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature related to multicultural education as a teaching strategy, and the

literature and research related to prejudice in the classroom and values education.

Chapter 3 explains the research methodology utilized, the pilot study, and the development of the multicultural instrument. Finally, it describes the selection of the population, the treatment, and the statistical procedures used to analyze the data.

Chapter 4 consists of the analysis of the data gathered and processes for the purpose of answering the problem formulated in Chapter 1.

Chapter 5 is a summary of the findings. It contains the conclusions and recommendations which resulted from this study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Multicultural Education as a Teaching Strategy

Multicultural education stresses a new interpretation of the word different as applied to cultural differences. Rivlin and Gold (1975:5) point out that:

> . . . different means different, not better than or worse than. It is illustrated by the story of a westerner who saw his Oriental friend putting a bowl of rice on his grandfather's grave and asked, "When will your grandfather get up to eat the rice?" To which his friend replied, "At the same time that your grandfather gets up to smell the flowers you put on his grave." Different means different, not better than or worse than.

In 1975, the National Council for the Social Studies recognized that the nation's schools needed sound guidelines for designing and implementing ethnic studies programs and for integrating their curricula with ethnic content. James P. Shaver (1976:ii), President, National Council for the Social Studies, expressed deep concern for a need for multiethnic education in the total school curriculum. He wrote the following:

> The school, as the formal educational institution of the society, has an important role to play in reducing the tensions and the injustices, including the misgivings about self, that result from unexamined ethnic beliefs and attitudes. . . . The NCSS curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education reflect the above concerns. They go beyond the social studies classroom and speak to the total school environment. . . .

Myths about multicultural education shape objectives that people set for schools. Such distortions are often illustrated by the multiplicity of themes that characterize different approaches to "multicultural education." The task of developing genuinely multicultural objectives in education is not an easy task. Terrence N. Tice (1977:123-125) suggests a useful component in a procedure for forming multicultural objectives would be to view the educational setting, process, and aims or products from four capacities for cultural experiences: congenital, inherited, acquired, and attained.

Tice (1977:123-125) feels that one of the basic problems to be considered in an inquiry into the meaning of culture is that of understanding how each person becomes the individual he or she is. The individual capacities for cultural experience must be taken into account in designing a genuinely multicultural approach to education. Congenital capacities are almost totally hereditary, physical environmental conditions both in the womb and from infancy can greatly affect which native capacities will be accessible to development. Inherited capacities which are not just biological are the primary carriers of culture and of personal identity. These traits are not easily given up. Acquired refers to a process of gaining to oneself by seeking things from the outside world. In contrast, that of attained refers to a process of gaining some end by reaching out, as if to touch by one's own distinctive efforts.

Each person contributes to human culture, sharing, in the continuing creation of mankind.

In setting multicultural objectives for the social studies curriculum as for the total school curriculum, this awareness of intrapersonal diversity can be used to good advantage. The greatest services to students occur where the space between them and others can be open without severely threatening what is already there.

PREJUDICE IN THE CLASSROOM

Racial prejudice is deeply rooted in the political and social history of the American people. Carl A. Grant (1975:184) points out that even the passage of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution did very little to stop racism. According to Grant (1975:184):

> Formalization is a part of the institutionalization process. Our nation's founders, by putting into words the beliefs that slaves were not full persons, thus giving formal recognition and acceptance to the idea that some races were better than others, were among those who helped to institutionalize racism in American society.

Colquit (1975:22) states that schools have helped to increase prejudice as an institution because they provide the opportunity to continually and systematically teach concepts necessary to maintain racism. According to Colquit (1975:22), some of this teaching has been quite overt, such

as the use of racially biased textbooks and the general lack of minority teachers and administrators.

For example, in history books, few black success models with assertive and aggressive behavior are included. Jesse L. Colquit (1975:22) states that Black heroes exemplifying Black manhood are usually found in sources other than basal textbooks. The reason for the omission is clear (Colquit, 1975:23):

> . . . whites in many cases make final decisions on which models are worth including. Thus, the most aggressive black men in history, men who asserted their manhood for freedom and dignity and attempted to define themselves from a black perspective and determine their own destiny, are almost always deleted from the student's history books.

Confining Black or other minority students to a homogeneous culture in the classroom results in a school curriculum that imposes negative images on these minority students and reinforces the thought that White is inherently superior (Colquit, 1975).

Bettye I. Latimer (1976:151) writes that all Americans have grown up in a society besieged with racism which society, for the most part, has chosen to ignore. She further states that the longevity of this war has been sustained by a sophisticated weapon known as "education." Books and other educational devices are some of the main pieces of artillery, and school children become the pawns.

Latimer's (1976:151) research shows that there are at least three types of racial prejudice found in the school

curriculum. The most common kind of prejudice found in the school curriculum is the omission of minorities from textbooks, AV materials, picture books, flashcards, readers and children's literature, and other teaching tools. The second kind of prejudice is books and materials replete with stereotypes. The third kind of prejudice is curriculum racism which presents inaccurate information and biased perspectives.

Rob Jeffcoate (1975:5) has found that children are socialized into ethnic prejudice in the same way they are socialized into other attitudes--through the four main agencies of home, peer group, mass media, and school.

Research has shown that students are capable of recording, internalizing, and reiterating the messages about other groups transmitted to them through these agencies by the time they start school (Jeffcoate, 1975:5). These same children are able to reject other groups by ages seven or eight. By the time students enter junior high school, discernible adult stereotypes have begun to appear. Jeffcoate (1975:7-8) reports that:

> Black and brown children, registering white society's and particularly their white peers negative evaluation of their color-being, in effect, the recipients of prejudice may well be brought to reject, or at least to develop ambivalent feelings toward their own identities and culture, with sometimes disastrous effects on their performance and behavior in school. . . the messages about black and brown people relayed to many young children by their classrooms may simply be a reinforcement of the messages they may have already received from home, community, or the media.

Schools have helped to increase racial prejudices. Grant (1975:184-185) states that the schools became very important in the institutionalization of prejudice because they provided the opportunity to continually and systematically teach the concepts necessary to maintain racism. Not only has racial prejudice been perpetuated by such overt acts as racially biased textbooks and the general lack of minority teachers and administrators, but by such covert means as the misuse of testing materials to inaccurately and unjustly label and classify students.

School textbooks served as a major vehicle for transmitting racial hatred and superiority during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Today, racism in textbooks still exists. In 1970, Michael Kane (Grant, 1975:184-185) made a study of minorities in textbooks. This study showed that the only difference between the racism in twentieth century text materials and that in the eighteenth and nineteenth century text materials is that it is less overt. Kane pointed out that while Blacks in contemporary society are no longer ignored, textbook treatment of the role of minorities in the United States continues to be weak and noncommittal; tokenism and complacent generalities continue to substitute for hard facts. Native Americans are still portrayed as "anti-hero" with a slight improvement in historical references, but contemporary facts are either missing or inaccurate. Kane found that there has been little improvement

in the textbook treatment of Asian Americans with very little attention paid to the Spanish speaking American.

Grant (1975:188) makes a strong plea for the elimination of prejudice in the school curriculum when he states that a curriculum written for Dick and Jane, living in white suburbia, often fails to meet the needs of the children in the ghettos, barrios, and on the reservations. Any school system that fails to provide a curriculum that meets the needs of all students is only further perpetuating prejudice.

The patterns of employment of minority teachers point out how schools are used as instruments of racism and prejudice. A statistical report from the National Council for Education Statistics (1975:71) shows significant gaps between the number of minority students in the schools and the number of minority teachers.

The institutionalization of racism in American schools sustains itself in a variety of ways. Consider the techniques and methods that many schools utilize to classify, label, and place minority students in classes that do irreparable harm to their self-concept and ability to achieve academically. Gertrude Noar's (1967) resource unit for teachers points out how dangerous prejudices are to the general well-being of minority children. In discussing the effect of prejudice on the individual child, she (1967:11) writes that:

> Minority group persons suffer from feelings of insecurity, guilt, frustration

> and anger as the result of the treatment they receive in our society. In many such children, learning is blocked, their aspirations are killed and they are unable to develop their potentialities. Many drop out of school. Moreover, those who do continue their education are often unable to find suitable employment; they suffer from despair and become apathetic, unproductive, and possibly dependent.

Smith and Piliavin (1969:1-24) did extensive research in the area of schools and prejudice. According to their report, the school in the core city ghetto tends to represent an educational system that is in itself prejudiced against the slum child--especially the Black slum child. The schools prejudge the child's life chance and becomes self-fulfilling in its prophecies. Smith and Piliavin (1969: 2) had this to say about the minority child's survival in the present-day school system:

> It disparages the child and, by undermining the basis on which he could develop self-respect and a sense of efficacy, it cripples his inborn human potentialities for taking advantage of the meager opportunities that remain open to him. It subjects the child to all manner of indignities. The system is manned by teachers and administrators who themselves have more or less prejudiced attitudes. Given their difficult and thankless task and their scant resources for coping with it, prejudice against their educationally unsuccessful pupils is a last bitter line of self-defense. But discrimination against slum children, prejudgment of the child's fate, is built into the system itself. The individual attitudes of teachers and administrative staffs are only components of the system. . . . Or we might consider how prejudice is built into the materials of the school curriculum to which virtually all children are exposed. . . .

> The persistently bland middle-class orientation of most school materials subtly purveys prejudice, both to the middle-class child, who is given a censored and misleading picture of the society in which he is later to play a part, and to the slum child, who cannot find his own experience validly represented and must conclude that it is a matter for suppression and shame or that school is something irrelevant, to be endured and resisted, an agency of "their" world, not of his own.

The results of a five-year study, Adolescent Prejudice, conducted by a team of social scientists, describes prejudice as "the nation's most virulent social disease." The findings (Glock, 1975:1-224) revealed that prejudice is rampant in the schools, and educators, more by default than by design, are failing to do much about it. This pivotal study sheds much light on the basic questions that account for prejudice and also for its absence. The researchers questioned 4,631 teenagers and teachers in three separate communities. The findings show that prejudice is nurtured among youths who have not developed the cognitive skills and sophistication to combat it. The study found that with some minor exceptions, racial prejudice followed the same contours as did anti-Semitism. Both were found more generally among the economically and academically deprived than among the more privileged. Enlightened values appeared to affect racial prejudice.

The Adolescent Prejudice data add support to the influence of peer groups and friendship patterns on the attitudes and prejudices of youth, the effect of associating

with prejudiced others is to exacerbate one's own prejudices. According to this five-year study (Glock, 1975:1-224), these associations take place both within and outside the school and are mutually reinforcing. Since many youth live in residentially segregated neighborhoods, the school is the only common meeting place where individuals experience the presence of others who differ from themselves. The curricular programs, the tracking system, the athletic and co-curricular programs (football may be a "black sport," soccer may be a "brown sport," swimming may be a "white sport"), all contribute to the kinds of groupings and sortings which limit contacts.

Adolescent Prejudice (Glock, 1975:180-220) makes three suggestions which will reduce or make prejudice so indefensible intellectually as to render it inoperative even for youngsters surrounded by prejudiced peers. The three suggestions which will enhance the kinds of educational input to teach youngsters not to fall victim to simplistic thinking are:

Instruction in the logic of inference

Instruction in how group differences come about

Instruction in understanding that group differences are matters of degree

The focus of the proposal is on developing cognitive sophistication as a means of contributing to upgrading the quality of education.

Dent (XXVI:167-177) conducted an experiment, "The Curriculum as a Prejudice Reduction Technique" in which 56 white female high school students were classified as High Females or Low Females in prejudice based on an F-scale score. Half the High Female and Low Female students were used as a control group, the remaining students participated in a prejudice reduction instruction program. The prejudice reduction instruction reduced prejudice only in Low Female students and, contrary to expectations, cognitive performance was unimproved in both High Female and Low Female students. Increased prejudice reduction instruction also failed to significantly decrease prejudice as expected. The results were interpreted in terms of: (1) a proposed prejudice stabilizing effect of the prejudice reduction instruction only in High Female students and (2) insufficient length of prejudice reduction instruction for Low Female students.

Lessing and Clarke (1967:3-16) did research in the area of prejudice reduction techniques at the junior high school level. The major purpose of their study was to evaluate the outcome of a multimedia, multiple influence-mode, intergroup relations curriculum offered in a school and community setting where racial issues created intense public controversy.

The eight-week intergroup relations curriculum (Lessing and Clarke, 1976:3-16) including readings, guest speakers, and the preparation of reports for presentation was provided for 89 of the 169 junior high pupils attending a nearly all-white suburban school. A control group of 80

students continued with their regular courses. Favorability and prejudice scores toward Latins, Jews, Asians, and Blacks (as measured by the attribution of descriptive objectives) did not change significantly as a function of exposure to the special course. The negative findings are attributed to the high level of racial tension in the community which was undergoing racial change and to the experimental subjects' choice of reading materials which reinforced many negative racial stereotypes while challenging others. The correlators of prejudice in this sample were primarily demographic and sociocultural rather than personal.

John A. Black (1977:104-111) explored a language approach to prejudice. The purpose of the study was to determine whether instruction in general semantics would reduce ethnic prejudice in high school students and to create a course of study in general semantics which would cause a reduction of ethnic prejudice.

The rationale behind the study was that prejudice is the result of a faulty cognitive process which, in turn, is the result of an unhealthy semantic environment. In other words, prejudice results when something happens to the way people think because they have allowed words to use them instead of their using words. This theory is discussed in Gordon Allport's The Nature of Prejudice (1975:1-519) and other works on prejudice.

In the test battery which tested the correlates of prejudice, the general semantics group average scores decreased in every instance, showing a decrease in prejudice.

At the same time, the group averages of both the regular English and anti-prejudice groups increased. Also, the anti-prejudice group increased in prejudice more than the regular English group in most cases (Black, 1977:104-111).

Black (1977:111) states that the important finding of his investigation is that the general semantics group did not increase in prejudice; it decreased in every correlate of prejudice tested.

SELF-IMAGE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO VALUES

Jersild (1952:123) viewed the self as

> a composite of thoughts and feelings which constitute a person's awareness of his individual existence, his concept of who and what he is. A person's self is the sum total of all that he can call his. The self includes, among other things, a system of ideas, attitudes, values, and commitments. The self is a person's total subjective environment. It is a distinctive center of experience and significance. The self constitutes a person's inner world as distinguished from the outer world consisting of all other people and things.

Carl Rogers (1961:87) reported that the self-structure was composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; precepts and concepts of self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive valence. In relating therapeutic outcomes, Rogers states that the self possessed the basic tendency toward maintenance and its own enhancement. His

words, in part, were, ". . . in successful psychotherapy, negative attitudes toward the self decrease and positive attitudes increase. . . The client not only accepts himself . . . he actually comes to like himself."

Wylie (1961) felt that the self-image was a learned constellation of not only perceptions and cognitions, but also values. An important part of this learning came from observing the reactions one got from other persons, especially parents.

More and more, counselors, teachers, and other persons in the helping relationship have been concerned with what the individual thinks and feels about himself. The perceptual, phenomenological, and existential approaches to personality have brought about increased emphasis on the self-image. Combs and Saper (1957) attempted to clarify the various problems of terminology by establishing semantic guideposts to include such constructs as the self, real self, concepts of self, the self-concept, influential nature of the self, self-rapport, and the ideal self. Many of the theories of personality which have been put forth within the last two decades have assigned importance to the phenomenal and/or non-phenomenal self-concept with cognitive and motivational attributes (Wylie, 1961).

In her book, The Self-Concept, Wylie (1961) presented an extensive review of the literature and research, including 493 articles concerned with the study of self-concept. The

review included instruments, populations, treatment techniques, etc. She was critical of the literature regarding the lack of clarity in the area of self-concept theory and emphasized very strongly her dissatisfaction with semantic confusion and lack of adequate research.

Wrenn (1958) reported in his review of the literature on the self-image in counseling. His summary was: (1) a start had been made in the study of self-image; (2) there appears to be substantial evidence that change in self-image is accompanied by increased acceptance of other; and (3) recent self-theories are operational in nature and subject to hypothesis testing.

Allport (1961) suggested the concept of a "proprium" or the individual's uniqueness in his personality. He (1961) stated that the growth to a fully developed and functioning individual required the feeling of self-esteem or a sense of one's self-worth. Allport (1961:162) emphasized the importance of a ". . . capacity for warm, profound relating of one's self to others. . . a compassionate regard for all living creatures." To the degree that this is happening in an individual, he is likely to feel positive about himself.

Research in the image of oneself and its relationship to the behavior of an individual has been explained by many psychologists and educators. For example, Rogers (1951:195) stated the "self-concept, or self-structure, may be thought of as an organized configuration of perceptions of the self

which are admissible to awareness." He (1951:195) saw three basic components of the self:

1. The image of oneself is highly organized, individualized, yet consistent, a changeable pattern of self-perceptions.

2. The individual's primary objective is that of bringing new self-experiences into line with characteristic ways of looking at himself.

3. The individual is healthy to the degree that he is open to a variety of experiences, and able to incorporate them into a concept of self.

Therefore, the self-concept is not a mere conglomeration or an addition of isolated images of self but a patterned interrelationship or a gestalt of these three components.

Recognition of teacher self-attitudes as important determinants of classroom management and student self-image has been well established in research literature. Moroney (1958), in a study to determine methods of studying self-concepts of teachers, found that interview and projective data were both practical and feasible for studying the teacher's self-concepts.

In a study on dogmatism as a means of predicting self-concept, Johnston (1967) showed that teachers scoring high on the Dogmatism Scale were more insecure, less positive, and rated children lower (bad) on the Semantic Differential Scale. He concluded that dogmatism can be used as an indicator of some aspects of self-concept.

Feldman (1962) investigated the recognition of affect in others between high and low dogmatics. Ninety-six subjects were designated high or low dogmatic according to their scores in the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The subjects viewed films of interviews between two individuals where one was the interviewer and the other was the interviewee. After seeing the filmed interview, the subjects were asked to respond to a personality questionnaire as they felt the interviewee would. Those responses were compared with those of the interviewee. They also rated the interviewee on a like-dislike continuum. The author found that high dogmatic subjects were significantly less accurate in understanding the interviewee than were the low dogmatic subjects.

Kemp (1960) administered the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale to 500 freshman college students. On the basis of their scores on the Scale, he selected 150 high dogmatic students and 150 low dogmatic students. Next he administered 100 problems in critical thinking to them. Kemp (1960:319) concluded that low dogmatics are more successful than high dogmatics in critical thinking:

> Educators need to become more aware that the poor performance of capable individuals may be due to closed minds. . . . Present implications are that in interpersonal relationships in which there is permissive safety the dogmatic individual more easily lowers his defenses and progress is toward perceiving problems as they really exist.

If one could become aware of his values and accept the values of others, he may become less dogmatic and improve his academic performance.

In another study, Stider (1961) found that defensiveness in the evaluation of others occurs primarily when the behavior is relevant to the individual's self-image.

In a study to determine decision-making behavior within the framework of self-theory, Vellutino (1969) found that people with positive self-concepts made better decisions given the same problem and alternative solutions.

Dealing with learning, growth of self, pupil behavior and general classroom mental health, Lafferty (1961) found that following participation in a voluntary mental health program, 121 teachers showed significant reductions in the frequency of maladaptive forms of interpersonal self-concepts. The teachers showed significant positive changes in actual self-concept on eight of the 16 interpersonal scales of the Interpersonal Adjective Check List. The teachers felt significantly more self-respective, independent, self-confident, and less doubtful of their own ability. They were less easily embarrassed, less apologetic, and less self-effacing.

Seidman (1969) explored the relationship of self-concepts of elementary school student teachers to their direct or indirect teaching behavior as determined by an interaction analysis system. The basic premise underlying the research was that self-concept was an important determinant of human behavior. Therefore, the self-concepts of the student teachers should be reflected in their patterns of teaching behavior as evidenced by their verbal interactions

with pupils in the classroom. The two instruments used in this study were (1) "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale," and (2) "The Flow Chart."

The findings of this study (Seidman, 1969) supported the major hypothesis that student teachers with high self-concepts tended to talk less during a teaching act than those with low self-concepts; student teachers with high self-concepts tended to more indirect teaching behavior than those with low self-concepts.

In general, research reports that the self-image is composed of many variables, of which values seem to be a major component. Research also indicates that there is a relationship between that self-image and behavior. More specifically, students and teachers with high self-concepts generally feel, perceive, and behave in more healthy and integrated ways. While this is encouraging, certain questions can be raised. What are values? How is the self-image influenced by values? What relationship is there between values and behavior?

VALUES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO BEHAVIOR

Research in the area of values is overwhelming in its magnitude. According to Dukes (1955:24-50) past value studies have used at least three major approaches: (1) measuring the values of groups or individuals and relating the results to other data concerning the groups; (2) origin

and development of values within the individual; and (3) the influence of an individual's values on his cognitive life.

Perkins (1954:223-242), in a historical overview of research relating to the problem of values, described studies of social and personal values. He gave evidence concerning the genetic, social, and cultural influences on the development of values. He briefly reviewed studies dealing with the genetic development of personality and ego-structure in relation to values. Finally, he described studies concerned with the relationship of school environment and social values of children. Without specific research to document his points, Perkins (1954:236) summarized by stating that: (1) the development of values is a continuous, complex process; (2) the consistency of valuing in the person is related to self-stability; (3) the individual's unique values determine his perception of and reaction to other persons and objects; and (4) values are learned from role models. Perkins closed his report by saying, "There is a need for critical formulation of the value problem in relation to education as a basis for urgently needed systematic research in this important area."

Brameld (1966), in a speech to the Conference on Youth at Meriden, Connecticut, cited several premises about values. He saw the problem of values as central to the solutions of a human existence of conflict. If it is central for humanity, certainly it is central to one man with conflicts

and choices to be made. Brameld stated that teacher and student education is to be included in the areas concerned with values and decision-making as well as values and conflict-resolution.

Abraham Maslow (1968) affirmed that basic needs and basic values are one and the same. He considered such basic values to be species-wide. Fulfillment of such value-needs depended upon the richness or poverty of the physical and social environment. The development of the individual, however, indicated value patterns that were unique. These patterns were related to the potentials of the person but also reflected uniqueness in everybody's environment.

From his experiences in helping people discover their inner processes of valuing, Rogers (1964) postulated fundamentally genetic or organismic basis for value directions in human behavior. Freed from outside influences, self-directing, fully functioning people tended to value similar objects, experiences, and goals. Such organismic commonality refers not to norms but to categories of things which people desire or need because they are human.

The cross-cultural and socio-political studies of values and valuing by Harold Lasswell (1959) complement the Rogerian approach and seem to affirm the species-wide value-needs suggested by Maslow. He discovered that while valuing techniques and strategies differ over long stretches of geography and time, men everywhere and in all ages tended to

direct their behavior toward certain categories of needs and wants. These he identified as affection, respect, skill, enlightment, power, wealth, well-being, and rectitude.

Since values seem to be derived from basic human needs and wants, what effect do they have on behavior? Hough and Amidon (1967), in a study comparing teachers' values (Dogmatism Scale) and behavior (Flanders Interaction Analysis) concluded that the teachers' change in the direction of (1) more empathetic relationships with students, (2) more use of data about students, (3) more experimental use of methodology, and (4) greater use of positive control measures were positive related to the relative openness and closedness of teachers' belief-disbelief system (as measured by Form E of the Dogmatism Scale).

Hough and Amidon (1967) continued to emphasize the influence of values on self-image and behavior when they stated that changes in verbal interaction patterns have been presented to show that positive change occurred primarily in those teachers who scored below the mean on the Dogmatism Scale.

Katin (1969), in a study of the relationship between values and the emotional adjustment of high school students, hypothesized that students of different adjustment levels would have differential value preferences. The results of the study suggested that there may be a relationship between maladjustment and divergence of value preference from the general student body.

Another study (Lewis, 1969) was designed to investigate and clarify the impact of value upon behavior. Lewis found in her study of 14-year-old males that an individual's value orientation does have an effect on his behavior. Lewis concluded that the relationship between values and behavior seems to be clearer at the upper-middle socio-economic levels than at the lower-middle and lower socio-economic levels. Values were related to four separate measures of behavioral coping effectiveness, and a positive relationship was shown. Lewis suggested that eventual manipulation of values might ease adjustment problems for many youth.

In a study relating value enhancement or deprivation to behavior, Carney (1971) found that there was little relationship between behavior and values of fifth grade children. It seemed that the major problems facing fifth grade children were finding ways of providing one's competence and being respected, thereby developing self-confidence. However, by the seventh grade, there was a definite relationship between value status (enhancement or deprivation) and behavior. If, by the seventh grade those problems of finding acceptable behaviors and self-confidence were not solved, there was a general weakening of the value system and drug abuse and other antisocial coping behaviors began to emerge.

The state of knowledge regarding the study of values and the relationship between values and behavior has not been solidified. Research does seem to indicate a

relationship between values and behavior, but more study needs to be conducted in this area. Certain questions may be raised as to how values are acquired. How does one learn how or what to value? Can this learning process be defined? What impact does assisting this learning have on behavior?

VALUING PROCESS AND VALUE CLARIFICATION PROGRAMS

Peterson (1970) feels that crucial to human development is a recognition of the importance of values and also a recognition that values cannot be merely handed to students or placed within a fixed curriculum with the expectation that students will experience them automatically as meaningful. It demands that we give attention to the process of valuing, which includes the process of choosing, of owning one's own values as his own, and of commitment. This means that one must be willing to question and, having questioned, to act in behalf of what is held to be constructively purposeful.

Rollo May (1963) views helping the other person in his own act of valuing as an essential and important step. He thinks that values should be creative, not static, but always changing, emerging, and growing. Values should not be accepted as full-blown.

Rucker (1969) sees the valuing process as the most basic human function. He views education, research, and therapy as specialized practices for clarifying, analyzing, and modifying the valuing process in both conscious and

unconscious experience. The observations and analyses focus upon valuing (the process) as much as on values (the goals, outcomes, or products). He defines value dynamics in human events very much like John Dewey or Herbert Mead did the transactional process in the social context and within the self. An individual seeks and selects values in the environment. The environment seeks and selects values in the individual. Although value systems of individuals are of interest, he feels that it is critical for the behavioral scientist and educator to gain and facilitate insight into the probable value consequences of this process.

Raths and Simon (1966;30) outlined several steps of the valuing process that one must experience in order to arrive at values. The steps are identical or grouped into three main activities which are choosing, prizing, and acting. These processes collectively define valuing. Consequently, the results of this process are called values.

Peterson (1970:227) stated that we have discovered some basic meanings with the term value, but the valuing process involves the individual within a dialectic of subject and object. He must come to terms with his own situation. He is the "being-in-the-world" and must come to own his own values, to recognize that he is responsible. The valuing process must be idiosyncratic--unique to each individual. It is through his experiencing that anything will become meaningful.

Rosenthal (1955:431-433) found evidence supporting his hypothesis that therapist-client interaction influences the client toward a pattern of "moral values" more consistent with that of the therapist. Twelve clients and their therapists were administered the Frank's Symptom-Disability Check List, the Allport-Vernon Lindzey Scale of Values, the Butler-Haig Self-Concept Q-Sort, and a moral values Q-sort devised by the author. At the end of their therapy experience, each client was interviewed by the researcher who used a semi-structured interview centering around client satisfaction. The interview was rated on a seven point scale as to whether the clients improved or not as a result of their therapeutic experience. Although Rosenthal found that changes in moral values were not very great, he suggested that this could be a result of the fact that only two of the 12 clients were rated improved. The implication is that if the therapist is unable to develop a situation where the client may improve, little changes in values takes place. Rosenthal suggested more research is needed in this area and in the area of rejection of therapist values as a result of negative therapeutic experiences.

Kohlberg (Davis, 1978) formulated a theory of moral development in which the central role is played by sequential structures of moral judgment. In this theory, qualitatively different modes of role-taking, the cognitive abilities to take into the account the others' perspective in order to

analyze moral dilemmas, are considered the determining factor in the unfolding of moral structures. Role-taking structures are less broad than logical structures and assume certain content distinctions (for instance, between physical and psychological reality, between subject and object). Like logic, they are forms of reasoning.

Because of these characteristics, Kohlberg (Davis, 1978) concludes that moral development not only proceeds along a specified series of stages but ought to proceed in that direction. In a critical and unwarranted step, Kohlberg extends the increasing universality and prescriptiveness from the forms of moral reasoning to the content of moral values.

The transition (Davis, 1978) from the form of knowledge to the content of values is not immediate or direct. Some other premise is required which is directly related to the nature of human personality. Kohlberg recognizes that one can ask, "Why should I be moral?" He considers facing and answering this question as another stage in the same sequence with and of the same nature as the forms of moral reasoning. The criteria that an individual resorts to in his search for an answer cannot be strictly formal but must refer to the content of his personality.

Lawrence Kohlberg (Davis, 1978) sees value development in sequential, natural stages. His theory helps to clarify moral issues and education.. He theorizes that the best way to foster moral development is through cognitive conflict. He

states that students should be exposed to value conflicts and encouraged to take moral stands. Schools can foster moral development if they structure curriculums giving students an opportunity to discuss and defend the rationale for their views.

Opinions, attitudes, and beliefs play an important part in a person's life. Opinions, attitudes, beliefs, and values are part of almost all phases of a person's relations with family, friends, and important groups. People are affected by others' opinions, attitudes, beliefs, and values according to who those others are and how strongly these values are held.

The teacher must recognize the interplay of valuing (subjective) and values (objective) within his classroom. The teacher must recognize that the student is an experiencing being and that values, to be meaningful, must grow from such experiencing. But the teacher must also recognize that the student lives within an objective world of which the teacher also is a part. The student is confronted by the question: "What does life expect of me?" and it is from this dialogue of subject and object that a synthesis of responsibility--a full valuing of "self" and "others"--can emerge. The teacher's task consists in the facilitation of this process.

What have been the effects on students when teachers do facilitate the valuing process? Klevan (1957) studied the effects of the values clarification techniques on a group

of college students, mostly sophomores taking a course in education at New York University. He was particularly concerned with: (1) changes in consistency of attitudes; (2) expressions of purposefulness; and (3) expressions of friendliness among class members. Klevan found that during the experimental period, students in the experimental class did develop significantly more consistent attitudes and did express more personal purposes than the students in the comparison classes.

Simon (1972) (Davis, 1973) reported a study in which 10 high school teachers were taught to use the value-clarifying processes. Each teacher was asked to choose a student who seemed to have a pattern of non-value-based behavior, specifically, who was apathetic, flighty, indecisive, or a nagging dissenter. Through an inservice program, teachers were to learn the techniques and apply them to the selected child. It seemed that high school teachers had difficulty in learning and using the theory. Simon suggests that it might be easier for elementary teachers or for teachers accustomed to more personal contacts with students. The subject matter orientation of secondary teachers seemed to be a substantial block to the development of interest in values.

In a later study, Simon (1978) (Davis, 1978) stated that young people are ultimately left to make their own choices about whose values to follow. Young people brought up by moralizing adults are not prepared to make their own responsible choices. They have not learned a process for

selecting the best and rejecting the worse elements contained in the various value systems which others have been urging them to follow. Too often the important choices in life are made on the basis of peer pressure, unthinking submission to authority, being accepted, a defense mechanism, and/or the power of propaganda.

James Raths (1960) reported on a careful study of the effect of the values clarification techniques on high school underachievers who were defined as students with high measured scholastic potential but low scholastic performance. In this study, 13 matched pairs of underachievers were formed. Raths found that during the one semester of the experiment, five of the six experimental students did better than their matched controls as measured by the improvement in grades and rank in class. This was reported as being significant at the .01 level.

G. Brown (1967) asked a group of 16 teachers (K-12) who were taking a college education course to respond to a values clarification program. The value clarifying questions were developed in response to a child who seemed to have unclear values. Teachers were required to keep a log of what happened. Each teacher also identified a second child in each class that was similarly a value case to act as a control. Control students received no special attention in values clarification. The experiment continued for 15 weeks and included children who were overconformers, dissenters, apathetic, underachievers, indecisive, and flighty.

All experimental children were reported to have improved markedly while none of the control children changed. An incidental finding of this study was that teachers and children enjoyed the process, and teachers themselves seemed to become much clearer about their personal values and, in many cases, more dedicated teachers. Brown states that teachers with whom she had been in contact after the experiment continued to use the techniques.

Although this study was informal and used imprecise and subjective measures, the reports of the teachers involved in this experiment indicate that the values clarification seemed to work well for them.

Carney (1972) found that when trained teachers implemented the values clarification process in the fifth and seventh grades, there was a significant shift in both attitudes and behaviors of children. Both fifth and seventh grade children shifted from more antisocial behavior (drugs, cheating, stealing, fighting) to more socially accepted aggressive and non-aggressive behaviors (sports, creative activities, social activities). Teachers also indicated in self-reports that there was less antisocial behavior in the classroom and on the schoolgrounds (stealing, lying, fighting, absenteeism). Children became more interested and motivated in school and more aware of their behavior as it affected others.

Again, research is scarce, but it seems to indicate that where teachers are trained in the use of value

clarifying skills, and where they are willing to impart these techniques to their students, there is an improvement in social behavior and academic achievement in those students. In all of these studies, there seems to be no research on the effect value clarifying skills have upon the self-image, attitude, or behavior of students who have chosen to transfer out of traditional educational institutions. Nor have provisions been made in traditional high schools to deal with students who have been identified as having poor self-images. High schools have not made any concerted attempts to identify students disadvantaged in this way.

It is the purpose of this investigation to determine the impact of values clarification as a strategy to reduce prejudicial attitudes of eighth grade students who are enrolled in the social studies curriculum of Meadowbrook Middle School, Poway, California. Chapter 3 details the research procedures used to attain this information.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The purpose of Chapter 3 is to detail the research procedures which are used to address the problem central to the study as delineated in Chapter 1. Thus, the chapter is concerned with the selection of a sample, the development of an instrument to be used in collecting the data, and the analysis of the data collected through the use of that instrument.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this research investigation is to determine the impact of values clarification strategy as a teaching methodology to reduce prejudicial attitudes of junior high students.

HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED

Hypothesis 1. There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in the reduction of racial prejudices.

Hypothesis 2. There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in the students' ability to clarify and analyze their own personal feelings, attitudes, and perceptions toward their own and other ethnic groups.

Hypothesis 3. There will be no significant difference

between the experimental group and the control group in personal prejudices of students against

1. older persons
2. women
3. handicapped persons

Hypothesis 4. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in their general attitude toward school.

Hypothesis 5. There will be no significant difference between males and females in their total attitudes on racial bias, on personal prejudices, on their ability to clarify their own values and on their general attitude toward school.

Hypothesis 6. There will be no significant difference between the eight ethnic groups on their total attitude toward racial bias, toward personal prejudices, in their ability to clarify their own values, and in their general attitude toward school.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to add to the existing knowledge of values clarification as a multicultural education teaching strategy when utilized as a prejudice reduction technique. This research investigation will test values clarification when used as a multicultural education teaching strategy for the reduction of prejudice in the eighth grade social studies curriculum.

THE POPULATION

This study included all eighth grade students at Meadowbrook Middle School, Poway Unified School District, Poway, California. Meadowbrook Middle School is a 6-8 grade school of approximately 1,110 students, 327 of whom are eighth graders. The student population is middle to upper middle class with average standardized test scores in the upper 40 percent based upon national norms (e.g., California Test of Basic Skills).

The school program is structured so that sixth grade students are in self-contained classrooms, except for physical education and music; and seventh and eighth grade students are with a "basic education" or "core" teacher for half the day and with specialty teachers for the remainder of the time.

Each basic education teacher instructs two core classes a day in reading, writing, spelling, and social studies. The five morning eighth grade classes served as subjects in the experimental group while students in the five afternoon classes served as the control group participants.

In this study the following research design was used:

Table 1

Research Design

Group	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
E_x	O_1	X	O_2
C_r	O_1		O_2

Experimental Group

In this research design, the pretest was administered in October 9-13, 1978, prior to treatment. The posttest was administered March 12-16, 1979, following the treatment.

Control Group

In this research design, the pretest was administered October 9-13, 1978, and the posttest was administered March 12-16, 1979. There was no treatment administered to the control group at any time during the study.

PILOT STUDY: "MEETSS-MULTIETHNIC EDUCATION ENRICHES THE SOCIAL SCIENCES"

Program Description

The pilot study was designed to assist all social science teachers in developing competencies needed to more successfully teach in a multiethnic society. The concept of multiethnic education encompasses more than observance of

holidays, tribute to famous persons, enjoyment of foods and festivals, or separate ethnic studies. It is a way of teaching that reflects an acceptance, an understanding, and an appreciation of the richness of American cultural diversity.

The goals were to assist participants in developing and implementing multiethnic education teaching strategies and units in the social sciences. A secondary goal was the development and field testing of an instrument to be used by the Sweetwater Union High School District in the assessment of multicultural attitudes of students.

Objectives of the MEETSS Program

1. Participants will clarify and analyze their own feelings, attitudes, and perceptions toward their own and other ethnic groups.
2. Participants will acquire the appropriate content and understanding of the historical experiences and sociological characteristics of American groups.
3. Participants will increase their instructional skills within multiethnic environments.
4. Participants will improve their skill in creating, selecting, evaluating, and revising instructional materials.

Background Information

This pilot study was initiated January 16, 1978, and completed on Thursday, June 1, 1978.

Dr. John Browne, Coordinator of Multicultural Education, San Diego County Department of Education; Dr. Jim R. Davis, then Assistant Professor of Multicultural Education/ Social Sciences, Northern Arizona University; Mr. James Boyle, Director of Curriculum, Sweetwater Union High School District; and Mrs. Nena Ratermanis, Multicultural Specialist, Sweetwater Union High School District, contributed much time and effort in the implementation of "MEETSS."

This pilot study was approved and funded by both the Sweetwater Union High School District as an inservice class through the Adult Education program for four units of hurdle credit and the San Diego State University Extension School Program for four units of university credit.

This study was based on a district-wide need as evidenced by a 1976-1977 Sweetwater Union High School District Multicultural Education component survey of 23 leadership personnel and 150 teachers and aides, 75 percent of whom stated that they needed inservice education or assistance in developing competencies in the following areas:

1. acquaintance with the influence of culture as it relates to individual behavior,
2. sensitivity and understanding of ethnic diversity,

3. revision of existing curriculum to incorporate multiethnic concepts,
4. acquaintance with instructional strategies in implementing multiethnic concepts,
5. acquaintance with multiethnic education evaluation instruments and techniques,
6. acquaintance with multiethnic education programs and curriculum materials.

Six of the 18 participants were junior high school social studies teachers in the inservice program. Various reading assignments were given to the participants by the consultants and the workshop leader. The participants developed a multiethnic teaching unit in their subject area to be implemented in 1978-79. Each participant field tested the Multicultural Student Survey in his/her school.

The class met three hours per week, 3:30-6:30 on Thursdays at Chula Vista Junior High. Each participant shared with the class what he or she did during the week that was related to the previous class meeting. These experiences took the form of oral reports. (See Appendix D.)

MULTICULTURAL STUDENT SURVEY

This instrument was constructed to identify the following personal characteristics, age, sex, race, ethnicity,

ethnocentrism, self-concept, and sexism. The Survey was developed by Nena Ratermanis, Sweetwater Union High School Multicultural Specialist; Ketter Chavez, Bilingual/Bicultural Special Projects Counselor, Special Projects, Sweetwater Union High School District; and the investigator of this research, at that time, Director of the Pilot Study MEETSS, Sweetwater Union High School District.

The instrument was presented to Sweetwater Union High School District Social Studies Chairperson, Bill Wappes; the District Social Studies Multicultural Education Committee; and Dr. John Browne, Coordinator of Multicultural/Social Studies, San Diego County Department of Education for review. On February 2, 1978, the Social Studies Multicultural Education Committee, along with Dr. Browne, submitted a two-page review of the instrument.

In order to refine the instrument and at the same time establish a basis for validity and provide additional support for the instrument's reliability, several procedures were followed. First, the Survey was given to 22 Sweetwater Union High School District school principals in order to establish content validity of the instrument. The principals followed the same directions as the students did in the study with one exception: there were 50 items instead of the regular 35. When all the administrators had completed the Survey, a discussion followed as to clarity, concept imagery, and willingness to respond. In like manner, the instrument

was administered to the participants in MEETSS. These 18 teachers were requested to point out ambiguities, make suggestions, and give an overall appraisal of the instrument. In addition, this interview procedure allowed the researcher, through direct conversation with the respondents, to determine the extent to which the scale actually measured that which it purports to measure.

According to Davis (1976:35], this technique is an another acceptable means of establishing face validity. Davis states that face validity ". . . concerns the extent to which an instrument looks like it measures what it is intended to measure." An additional quote from Davis is perhaps significant. He (Davis, 1976:35) writes that the most direct approach to the measure of human attitudes is to ask a respondent what his attitude is.

The reliability for the Multicultural Student Survey was established by using the test-retest method (Winer, 1962) in computing a Pearson product moment reliability coefficient. Sixty eighth grade students from Chula Vista Junior High School, Sweetwater Union High School District, were given the Survey a second time approximately 14 days after they had responded to the first testing.

A correlation coefficient was computed for each individual item on the Survey excluding items 1 through 4. Items 1 through 4 seek demographic information about the

participants. The range of reliability on items 31 through 35 is from .49 to .83 as indicated in Appendix B.

The Multicultural Student Survey was rewritten and field tested on March 9, 1978 with 270 secondary students in Sweetwater Union High School District. The results were evaluated March 16, 1978, by the MEETSS participants and refined into its present state. It was administered to 465 students on May 18, 1978, in the Sweetwater Union High School District. Mrs. Ratermanis used the results as a needs assessment survey to support her recommendation that more teacher inservice programs are needed in multicultural education.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

This section is devoted to a discussion of the statistics which were employed in the analysis of the data, as well as the procedures used. The Multicultural Student Survey is composed of 35 statements, 31 of which are designed to survey the prejudicial attitudes of the students. The first four items merely gather descriptive data about the respondents such as age, sex, and race. Respondents indicate their choice by marking in the appropriate circle on the answer sheet. Each statement carried five choices with the exception of statements one and four. Statement one carried three choices, while statement four provided six choices. Each response was weighted with numerical values from 0 to 3 and the data were placed in frequencies.

To test the six hypotheses, the t-test (Winer, 1962) was used for each hypothesis. The 31 items of the questionnaire were divided up and used as part of the evaluation for one hypothesis. More concretely, the evaluation of hypothesis one was conducted by adding the responses for item 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 23, 25, 29, 31, and 35 together and then averaging the pre- to posttest gains for all the items. The t-test (Winer, 1962) was then computed between the average gains for the experimental group and for the control group as a method for finding significant differences for each hypothesis.

This procedure was used on the first four hypotheses. In addition, though the t-test was used to evaluate the average gains between the experimental and control groups over several items to test each hypothesis, each item used as part of that hypothesis was evaluated individually with a t-test (Winer, 1962) to determine if there was a significant change from pre- to posttest on this item. Hypothesis five and six were tested through a two-way analysis of variance (Winer, 1962). For hypothesis five, the total test score for males and females was calculated as were the totals from pre- to posttest. Then the difference between males and females, and that between pre- and posttest were evaluated for significance with the analysis of variance.

For hypothesis six, the total test score for the eight ethnic groups was calculated as were the totals from

pre- to posttest. Then the difference between the eight groups and that between pre- and posttest were tested for significance with the analysis of variance.

If, for either of these hypotheses there was a significant difference, a further analysis of each of the 31 items involved was planned by using a t-test or an analysis of variance for hypotheses five and six, respectively.

It was decided that any statistical tests of differences between groups would have to occur by chance only 5 percent or less of the time, in order for the six null hypotheses to be rejected. This level of significance was chosen because: (1) this set the chance of making a Type I error at 5 percent; (2) this level of chance is a very traditional and well-respected indicator of treatment effect; and (3) this level is generally conservative and less likely to result in a Type II error.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter, the statistical analysis and the effect on the acceptance or non-acceptance of the six null hypotheses as stated previously, will be presented. In addition, a discussion and interpretation of these analyses will accompany each evaluation of an hypothesis.

The items as stated on the Multicultural Student Survey and central to the purpose of this study are Items 1, 2, 3, and 4.

There were 327 students enrolled in the eighth grade at Meadowbrook Middle School during 1978-79. A total of 292 completed the Multicultural Student Survey, 121 subjects in the experimental group and 171 subjects in the control group. There are 35 students who were absent during the time that the surveys were administered and they were not included in the pre- and posttesting.

The subjects involved in the experimental and control groups were almost equally divided as to sex. The experimental group was 50.5 percent male and 49.5 percent female, while the control group was 52.5 percent male and 47.5 percent female. Likewise, the experimental and control groups were very nearly equal in age with both groups averaging 13.4 years.

The experimental group contained 219 White Americans; 13 Black Americans; 16 Asian Americans; 20 students who

described themselves as Mexican Americans; three Chicanos; one Latino; five Native Americans; and two Mexicans. The control group had 249 White Americans; nine Black Americans; 15 Asian Americans; 13 Mexican Americans; two Chicanos; eight Latinos; 14 Native Americans; and 11 Mexicans.

In summary, there was no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group on sex, age, or ethnic background.

Hypothesis One

> There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in the reduction of racial prejudice.

To test the first null hypothesis, which related to a reduction of racial prejudice, the data for the two groups were analyzed through a t-test of the average gain scores for the 12 test items. (Refer to Multicultural Student Survey, Appendix A.) Mean scores for the experimental and control groups for each of the 12 items appear in Table 2. This table reflects the changes that occurred in the mean scores for each item from pre- to posttest for the experimental and control groups, as well as the average score for the 12 items and the average gain obtained by the experimental and control group. It can be seen that the experimental group demonstrated a gain of .07 (from an average

of 2.26 to an average of 2.33) from pre- to posttest while the control group lost .01 in average score (from an average of 2.32 to an average of 2.31). Compilation of the t-test on these average gains indicated that there was no significant difference between the two groups ($t(22) = .95$, $p > .05$). Resultingly, the null hypothesis of no difference between the two groups is supported.

Table 2

Mean Scores for Items Tested in Hypothesis One

Item	Experimental		Control	
	Pre- $\bar{X}$	Post- $\bar{X}$	Pre- $\bar{X}$	Post- $\bar{X}$
9	2.89	2.78*	2.83	2.74*
10	2.51	2.66*	2.52	2.49*
11	1.20	1.21*	1.02	1.46**
12	2.57	2.48*	2.55	2.42*
15	2.54	2.67*	2.45	2.79**
16	2.71	2.82*	2.91	2.82*
17	2.38	2.36*	2.24	2.36*
23	2.49	2.56*	2.57	2.55*
25	2.42	2.49*	2.49	2.47*
29	2.45	2.53*	2.63	2.51*
31	1.65	1.89*	1.86	1.85*
35	1.32	1.48*	1.80	1.34**
Overall Score	2.26	2.33	2.32	2.33
Average Gain Score	+ .07		- .01	

*Gain Nonsignificant
**Gain Significant, $p < .01$

Examination of the data on Table 3 for questions 10, 15, 25, and 35, which showed significant changes in the frequency of response, does not reflect any consistent pattern. Only by adding the information from Table 2 can it then be noted that on items 15 and 35 is there some consistency. On these two questions, the control group significantly changed their average response and their response frequency. On item 15 the control group improved their average score (a gain of .24 units) while on item 35 they reduced their average score (a loss of .46 units), thereby seemingly indicating more random fluctuation rather than treatment (or lack of treatment) effect.

Table 3

Items from Hypothesis One with Significant Pre-Post Scores

Item	Experimental Pre-Post Differences		Control Pre-Post Differences	
	Chi-square	Sig.	Chi-square	Sig.
10	7.47	.05	7.16	.07
15	4.76	.19	13.12	.00
25	8.68	.03	1.048	.78
35	4.20	.24	9.42	.02

df = 3

Interpretation of these data, overall, indicates that the two groups did not significantly alter their racial attitudes and the null hypothesis is therefore accepted. Further, examination of individual questions for significant changes suggests that though certain items did differ significantly from pre- to posttest, there was no single pattern which supported a treatment effect.

Hypothesis Two

> There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in the students' ability to clarify and analyze their own personal feelings, attitudes, and perceptions toward their own and other ethnic groups.

To assess the second hypothesis concerning the students' ability to clarify their own feelings and attitudes toward their own and other ethnic groups, a t-test on the gains scores for the 10 questions was calculated. The mean scores for the 10 questions for the pre- and posttest averages is seen in Table 4 and shows that the experimental group gained approximately .08 units from pre- to posttest, while the control group lost .09 units over this same period as noted in the average scores for the two groups. The t-test (Winer, 1962), using gains scores, indicated that there was significant differences ($t(18) = 2.48$, $p > .05$). As

such, these results indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis supported.

Table 4

Mean Scores for Items Tested in Hypothesis Two

Item	Experimental		Control	
	Pre- $\bar{X}$	Post- $\bar{X}$	Pre- $\bar{X}$	Post- $\bar{X}$
5	2.64	2.66*	2.63	2.73*
6	2.37	2.50*	2.45	2.45*
7	1.70	1.67*	1.63	1.60*
8	1.76	1.75*	1.70	1.77*
14	1.11	1.26*	1.50	1.21*
21	1.53	1.60*	1.59	1.58*
27	1.50	1.59*	1.49	1.46*
28	1.59	1.61*	2.13	1.88*
30	2.02	2.28**	2.23	2.21*
34	1.15	1.24*	1.59	1.25*
Average Score	1.74	1.82*	1.90	1.81*
Average Gain Score	+ .08		- .09	
Standard Deviation	0.478	0.51	0.516	0.483

*Gain Nonsignificant
**Gain Significant, $p < .05$

Question 30 indicates that there are extreme differences in pre- and posttest averages for the experimental group.

This item reflects strong growth in an individual's process for choosing friends, moving from making choices on the basis of racial values to one that is not racially influenced. The evidence does suggest that the program had an impact on this process and value. These results suggest that the experience the students had did have a significant effect on their ethnic values.

From the statistical analysis by a t-test, the experimental group was demonstrated to have gained more than the control group across these 10 items. Also, one can readily note that on eight of the 10 questions, the experimental group showed positive growth while the control group showed such growth on only two items.

In summary, the null hypothesis that the experimental and control groups would not significantly differ as to change in their own and others' ethnic backgrounds was rejected. This, then, suggests that the current program did have an impact on these values and that the value technique is a viable method for improving and developing positive ethnic awareness and perception.

Hypothesis Three

There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the

control group in personal prejudices
of students against older persons, women,
and/or the handicapped.

To evaluate hypothesis three concerning the differences between the two groups in prejudice toward older persons, women, and the handicapped, a t-test of the gain scores was again calculated. The mean scores for each of the questions used in the analysis appear in Table 5 and show that the experimental group made a positive change pretest to posttest (from an average of 2.25 to 2.28) while the control group achieved lower scores on posttest (from an average of 2.33 to an average of 2.23 on the posttest). The t-test (Winer, 1962) on the average gain, indicated that the minimal change seen in mean scores was not significant ($t(4) = 1.36$, $p > .05$), and further analysis of the data by other statistics did not indicate any significant change. Resultingly, for hypothesis three, the null hypothesis was supported.

This outcome would then indicate that the treatment program did not significantly alter the students' attitudes toward the elderly, women, and the handicapped. And, as Table 5 indicates, both the experimental and control groups entered the program with positive attitudes toward these three groups (the elderly, women, handicapped), a condition which allowed little opportunity for positive change in these attitudes.

Table 5

Mean Scores for Items Tested in Hypothesis Three

Item	Experimental		Control	
	Pre- $\bar{X}$	Post- $\bar{X}$	Pre- $\bar{X}$	Post- $\bar{X}$
18	2.59	2.57*	2.58	2.49*
22	2.25	2.25*	2.23	2.19*
23	1.94	2.01*	2.18	2.01*
Average Score	2.26	2.28*	2.33	2.23*
Average Gain Score	+ .02		- .10	
Standard Deviation	0.325	0.28	0.218	0.242

*Gain Nonsignificant

Hypothesis Four

There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups' attitude in their general attitude toward school.

To test hypothesis four, a t-test (Winer, 1962) was conducted using the average gain scores from the items that appear in Table 6.

Table 6

Mean Scores for Items Tested in Hypothesis Four

Item	Experimental		Control	
	Pre- $\bar{X}$	Post- $\bar{X}$	Pre- $\bar{X}$	Post- $\bar{X}$
13	1.52	1.66*	1.58	1.63*
19	1.79	1.98*	1.99	2.12*
20	2.23	2.00*	2.15	2.18*
24	1.94	1.92*	2.20	2.08*
26	1.95	1.68*	2.07	1.78*
32	2.01	2.25*	2.33	2.17*
Average Score	1.71	1.92*	2.05	1.99*
Average Gain Score	+ .21		- .04	
Standard Deviation	0.237	0.221	0.259	0.231

*Gain Nonsignificant

This hypothesis allowed evaluation of the students' general perceptions of "life at school." The average scores of the questions evaluated by hypothesis four appear in Table 6 and reflect that, in general, the experimental group students slightly improved their school attitude during the treatment sessions (a gain of 0.21) while the control group students lost in their school attitude (a

loss of 0.04). A t-test (Winer, 1962) of the average gain scores for these questions indicated that there was no significant change in scores ($t(10) = 0.60$, $p > .05$). The two groups did not significantly differ in their attitudes toward school from pre- to posttest and, therefore, supports the null hypothesis of no difference between the two groups.

Examination of the individual items indicated that no one item demonstrated any statistically significant change despite the fact that a number of questions revealed changes in the average pre- and posttest scores.

Hypothesis Five

There will be no significant difference between males and females in their total attitudes and values.

The analysis of the differences between males' and females' attitudes and values was done by an analysis of variance using the ANOVA program from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) by Nie, Hull, et al. (1970). In this analysis, the sex of the individual, as well as pre- and posttest scores were used as independent variables. As illustrated in Table 7, this analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between the scores of males and females ($F(1,277) = p < .001$) but not between pre- and posttest scores ($F(1,277) = 0.59$, $p = 0.443$).

Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Males' and Females' Total Score

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	f	Probability
Sex	4003.18	1	4003.18	25.61	0.000
Pre-Post Test	92.15	1	92.15	0.59	0.443
Interaction	155.79	1	155.79	0.997	0.319
Within	43305.82	277	156.34		
Total	47559.51	280	169.86		

This significant difference between males and females results in the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Since there was no significant change in pre- to posttesting total score and since there was a significant difference between males and females, the pretest scores of the males and females were examined to reveal the possible reason for this difference. By examining the pretest scores, one could then conclude whether the program caused the differences or if the differences had existed prior to the commencement of the program.

Table 8 presents only those questions in which there was a significant difference prior to the beginning of the training. On 19 of the 31 items of the questionnaire,

Table 8

Significant Pretest Questions for Males and Females

Item	Male	Female	Probability
6	2.34	2.55	0.005
7	1.54	1.78	0.004
8	1.66	1.88	0.005
9	2.75	2.88	0.008
12	2.25	2.77	0.000
13	1.19	2.02	0.000
15	2.52	2.74	0.002
16	2.69	2.94	0.000
17	2.17	2.52	0.000
18	2.44	2.66	0.007
19	1.80	2.18	0.000
23	2.40	2.70	0.000
24	1.96	2.12	0.045
25	2.34	2.60	0.002
27	1.42	1.60	0.028
29	2.41	2.64	0.007
30	2.00	2.37	0.000
31	1.66	1.96	0.006
33	1.83	2.23	0.000

there were significant differences determined by the t-test subroutine of SPSS (Nie, Hull, et al., 1970).

In Table 9, the findings of significance between males and females calculated again by the t-test subroutine of SPSS appear. There are significant differences between males and females in total test performance ($p = 0.000$).

Table 9

Significant Pretest Differences in Total Test and the Four Hypotheses

	Male	Female	Probability
Total Test	61.14	68.00	0.000
Hypothesis 1	26.33	29.00	0.000
Hypothesis 2	17.28	19.05	0.000
Hypothesis 3	6.47	7.16	0.000
Hypothesis 4	11.02	12.69	0.000

One difference between males and females remains significant even if the items are broken down into the four areas evaluated by the first four hypotheses.

The significant difference demonstrated by the analysis of variance does not appear to be due to any systematic effect of the training paradigm, but a difference that seems to be present prior to the onset of training. Further examination of the total test score in Table 9 shows

that males had a mean total score of 61.14 while females had a 68.00. This discrepancy in which females outscore males is also apparent in all four hypotheses.

Why are females scoring significantly higher than males? This higher total score for females seems to reflect less bias in racial and ethnic values and seems to suggest that the females in this study were more tolerant of differences in people than males.

In summary, the fifth hypothesis was rejected due to a significant difference between the total scores for males and females; however, the fact that these significant differences were present at the time of pretesting points out that the discrepancy in males' and females' values were due to the values they possessed prior to their entry into the program.

Hypothesis Six

> There will be no significant difference between the eight ethnic groups on their total attitudes and values.

This hypothesis was tested through the analysis of variance with the eight groups and pre- or posttesting used as the independent variable and pre- and posttesting as a moderator variable. This analysis, which appears in Table 10, was computed by the ANOVA subroutine of the SPSS package and demonstrates that there was no significant difference

between the different ethnic groups ($F(6,278) = 0.560$, $p = 0.76$); nor was there any significant difference between pre- and posttest scores ($F(1,278) = 1.10$, $p = 0.296$). As a result, the null hypothesis is accepted and it is reasonable to conclude that there was no treatment effect due to the program, nor was there any difference between the ethnic groups. In fact, the mean scores detailed in Table 11 reveal that there are minimal differences for each ethnic group from pre- to posttest. The largest deviation, which occurred in the scores for those individuals classifying themselves as Latino, showed a gain of only 0.30 more points than pretest scores which represents only a variance of 0.5 percent.

Table 10

Analysis of Variance for Ethnic Groups as Pre- and Posttests

Source of Variation	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	f	Probability
Ethnic Group	566.19	6	94.37	0.560	0.762
Pre-Posttest	185.09	1	185.09	1.10	0.296
Interaction	110.48	6	18.41	0.11	0.99
Within	46869.13	278	168.59		
Total	47712.64	291			

Table 11

Mean Scores on the Pre- and Posttest for the Seven Ethnic Groups

Ethnic Groups	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Mexican	72.50	72.39	- 0.11
Mexican American	69.70	69.75	0.05
Latino	70.75	70.05	0.30
Native American	68.20	68.25	0.05
White American	64.90	64.90	0.00
Black American	64.33	64.32	- 0.01
Asian American	65.33	65.19	- 0.12

The data reveal that the current program had a minimal impact upon the different ethnic groups. In summary, the sixth null hypothesis of no difference between the various ethnic groups was accepted and a general conclusion of no impact of the program upon the groups was drawn.

The final chapter will provide a summary of the program, conclusions, discussion and recommendations.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the impact of values clarification strategy as a teaching methodology to reduce racial prejudicial attitudes of eighth grade students. To accomplish this goal, a Multicultural Student Survey was constructed, assessed for validity, tested for reliability, and administered to a stratified sampling of eighth grade students at Meadowbrook Middle School, Poway, California. Using this technique, the researcher obtained answers to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis One. There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in the reduction of racial prejudices.

Hypothesis Two. There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in the students' ability to clarify and analyze their own personal feelings, attitudes, and perceptions, toward their own and other ethnic groups.

Hypothesis Three. There will be no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in personal prejudices of

students against

1. older persons
2. women
3. handicapped persons.

Hypothesis Four. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in their general attitude toward school.

Hypothesis Five. There will be no significant difference between males and females in their total attitudes on racial bias, on personal prejudices, on their ability to clarify their own values, and on their general attitude toward school.

Hypothesis Six. There will be no significant difference between the eight ethnic groups on their total attitude toward racial bias, toward personal prejudices, in their ability to clarify their own values, and in their general attitude toward school.

To gather the data essential for answering the six research hypotheses, one instrument was constructed and administered to both experimental and control groups as a pre-post test. The instrument was designed to give demographic characteristics of the respondents (Items 1, 2, 3, and 4) in both the experimental and control groups, as well as test the above stated hypotheses.

The sample population in this study was the eighth grade class at Meadowbrook Middle School, Poway, California. A total of 292 students completed the Multicultural Student Survey; 121 subjects in the experimental group; and 171 subjects in the control group. In true stratified random fashion, the morning classes were designated "experimental," while the afternoon classes were labeled "control."

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings presented here are those which describe the demographic characteristics of the student population.

The experimental and control groups in this program were divided according to sex (51 percent male, 49 percent female). Seventy-five percent of the experimental group were Anglo while in the control group 85 percent were Anglo. The remaining participants were from different minority backgrounds. Likewise, both the experimental and control groups were of a similar age. Statistical tests of age, sex, or racial composition indicated that the experimental and control groups did not significantly differ on these characteristics.

Hypothesis One

To test the first null hypothesis, which had to do with the reduction of racial prejudice, the data for the two groups were analyzed through a t-test of the gain scores for the following 12 test questions: 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17,

23, 25, 31, and 35. The t-test (Winer, 1962) indicated that there was no significant difference between the two groups ($t(22) = .44$, $p > .05$) and merely supported the null hypothesis of no group differences.

Though the null hypothesis was supported, several items demonstrated significant differences when an analysis is completed between the pre- and posttests. These differences were not consistent and apparently reflected random effects, and no conclusion could be reached through this analysis.

Hypothesis Two

To assess the second hypothesis concerning the students' ability to clarify and analyze their own personal feelings and attitudes toward their own and other ethnic groups, a t-test on the gain scores for the 10 items listed was calculated: 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 21, 27, 28, 30, and 34. Results of the analysis on the gain scores indicated that there were no significant differences ($t(18) = 2.48$, $p < .05$) which resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis. Since the null hypothesis was rejected, one must conclude that the program had a significant impact upon the individual's awareness of ethnic heritage and values. This approach, then, seems to offer a strategy that can help students to become more aware of their own and others' ethnic attitudes and values.

Hypothesis Three

To evaluate hypothesis three concerning the differences between the two groups in prejudices against older persons, women, and the handicapped, a t-test on questions 18, 22, and 33 was again calculated with the gain scores. The t-test (Winer, 1962) supported the null hypothesis ($t(4) = 1.36$, $p > .05$) of no significant difference between the means.

Hypothesis Four

This hypothesis evaluated the question, "Did the program have a significant impact upon the two groups?" To answer this question, a t-test of the gain scores was again calculated using items 13, 19, 20, 24, 26, and 32. This t-test again indicated that there was no significant change in scores ($t(10) = 0.60$, $p > .05$).

Hypothesis Five

This hypothesis focused on the diverging views held by individuals of the two sexes and assessed the impact of the program upon these two groups. The analysis of variance was used to test the differences between males and females and the differences from pre- to posttest. This analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between males and females ($F(1,277) = 25.61$, $p = 0.001$) in the values, but that there was no significant change in their scores from pre- to posttest ($F(1,277) = 0.59$, $p > .05$).

Further analysis of the pretest scores by a t-test (Nie, Hull, et al., 1970) indicated that the pretest scores of males and females significantly differed in 19 of 31 items and that, not only did the sexes significantly differ on their total questionnaire scores, but also sexes significantly differed on the four hypotheses that had been advanced.

In conclusion, it was felt that, though the null hypothesis had been rejected, the differences in the way the males and females scored was due to values that the students brought into the program and were not a function of the program.

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis six attempted to evaluate the effects of the program on the values and attitudes of students coming from six ethnic groups. To test this hypothesis, an analysis of variance was calculated and demonstrated that the six ethnic groups did not significantly differ in their values ($F(6,278 = 0.566, p > .05$) nor did their pre- and posttest scores differ significantly ($F(1,278) = 1.10, p > .05$). As a result, the sixth null hypothesis was accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Given the limitations of the study, the value clarification technique did not significantly reduce racial prejudicial attitudes of the experimental group.

2. The experimental group reflected significant gain in their ability to clarify and analyze their own personal feelings, attitudes, and perceptions toward their own and other ethnic groups. The values clarification treatment impacted most strongly the students' process for choosing friends, moving from making choices on the basis of racial values to non-racially influenced choices. Values clarification is a viable multicultural education teaching strategy to be utilized for improving and developing positive ethnic awareness and perception.
3. The values clarification program did not significantly change the students' attitudes toward the elderly, women, and the handicapped. The students entered the program with positive attitudes towards these groups and the treatment did not change their attitudes.
4. Given the parameters set by the study, the values clarification program did not significantly alter the students' general perception of school.

5. Data of the study indicate a significant difference between males and females in their total attitudes and values. However, it is not clear if the program made the difference or if the difference existed prior to treatment.
6. Within the framework designed by the study, the eight ethnic groups did not significantly change their total attitudes and values as a result of participation in the values clarification treatment program.

DISCUSSION

The first point that needs to be addressed is that of the six null hypotheses advanced, only the second demonstrated significant change from pre- to posttest. In this one case, it must be noted that the pretest scores were much lower, averaging 1/2 point lower than those used in evaluating hypotheses one and four. As stated earlier, the fact that only one of the four hypotheses evaluating the program's overall effectiveness significantly differed. This indicates that the program had its greatest effect on ethnic awareness. Likewise, this seems to reflect the fact that many of our students are not aware of their own

ethnic heritage. Apparently, this approach offered in this training package provided the students with a way for improving their ethnic awareness.

The second outcome of this study is noted in the significant differences between the attitudes of males and females. These strong differences, which appear on 19 of the 31 items, point out that females are more accepting of others while males are less so.

Similarly, Reilly (1979:312-316) discusses the occurrence of sexual differences in boys and girls in the development of sex-typing and points out that boys are usually more sex-typed than girls, for example, they have very specific ideas of what they should play with and why. The current data suggest that in regard to ethnic attitudes, boys and girls once again show a definite split based primarily on their own sex-role identity.

Similar outcomes are reported by Hennessey and Merrifield (1978:385-379) in their examination of nearly 3000 college-bound urban high school seniors on a multiple attitude battery. Their results which indicate that the sex of the individual often results in differing abilities in areas such as verbal or reasoning ability or attitude toward technology reinforces the results of this current study. It would seem then that sexual differences result in widely differing values in many areas. Most interestingly, these values seem to be very strong toward ethnic attitudes and beliefs.

Clearly, this current approach did not have a significant impact on altering these values. Reilly (1979:312-316) suggests that the junior and senior high years are too late to intervene. Yet, this current program did have a significant impact on some of the values and attitudes of the participants. Since this is so, it seems that one could have an impact on the "ethnic" sexual awareness of males and females. Perhaps, individuals of each sex are really unaware of the fact that their beliefs are seemingly "sexually" determined. Research, obviously, needs to be done to further evaluate these values and to try to see if such values can or need to be changed.

In summary, of the six hypotheses advanced, only two, the second and fifth, showed significant differences. The significant differences in the second suggested that this program would be a viable tool for altering ethnic attitudes. The significant difference in the fifth appeared to be a function of attitudes that the students began with and did not indicate that the program had a significant impact on them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the findings of this study, the following recommendations for further research are offered.

1. Future research studies should be designed in a manner that will allow

those teachers interested in utilizing values clarification as a multicultural teaching technique to so indicate.

2. Research is needed to determine what methods of multicultural education are actually used in the classroom and to what effect. If the findings indicate that little is known about the various strategies, then it is recommended that inservice education programs be designed to remedy that situation.
3. Since schools are supported by the local community and reflect community values, it would be beneficial to assess community values and mores. In this manner, education could make multicultural education more palatable in instances where the goals of multicultural education differ from community values. In addition, it might also make possible the development of community education programs which would develop community support for multicultural education programs which do not conform exactly to those values held by the community as a whole.

4. Inservice education programs should be developed to assist teachers in eliminating the logical inconsistencies in their own system of values, so that they might be more effective in providing/teaching in multicultural environment/climate in the classroom.
5. Further examination of the impact of sex related issues on multicultural values and attitudes needs to be explored.
6. More research should be done to determine if multicultural educational approaches should focus more heavily on ethnic awareness and "personal" culture. Since alterations of attitude did occur in this area, it would appear to be a viable approach for significantly impacting on students.
7. It is recommended that further study needs to be done with this questionnaire or something similar to determine what the relationship is between attitudes to races and other groups and ethnic awareness. Does racial perception vary directly with ethnic awareness? If so,

perhaps the best technique to improve racial understanding and awareness is to focus on our ethnic heritages and the similarities and differences between individuals within our society. Further analysis of such data could give us a better understanding of how these important values are related and how we might begin to foster better programs to assist integration and other similar forces.

REFERENCES CITED

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

Abbey, David S. VALUE: A Discussion Guide for Personal Decision-Making. Human Development Institute, Instructional Dynamics Corporation, Chicago, Illinois, 1973.

Allport, Gordon W. ABC's of Scapegoating. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith, 1969.

_____. Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

_____. The Nature of Prejudice. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Co., 1954.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Board of Directors. "Multicultural Statement Officially Adopted in November, 1972." William Hunter (Ed.) Multicultural Education Through Competency-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D.C., October, 1974.

Banks, James. Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

_____. "Black Image: Strategies for Change." Black Image--Education Copes with Color. Grambs and Carr (Eds.) William Brown, Publisher, 1972, pp. 147-154.

_____. Teaching the Black Experience: Methods and Materials. Belmont, California: Fearon Publishers, 1970.

_____. "A Content Analysis of the Black American in Textbooks." Social Education, December, 1969.

Black, John. "Attitude Change and Prejudice." Etcetera: A Journal Devoted to the Role of Symbols in Human Behavior, March, 1977, 1 - Vol. 34, pp. 104-111.

Bowman, P. H. "A Study of the Consistency of Current Wish and Proper Self-Concept as a Measure of Therapeutic Process." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1951.

Brameld, T. "A Philosopher Looks at the Current Values and Changing Needs of Youth." Speech given at Conference on Youth, Meriden, Connecticut, August 29, 1966.

Brown, George J. "An Investigation of a Methodology for Values Clarification, Its Development, Demonstration and Aspiration." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1967.

Brown, John R. "Multicultural Press in Elementary School Classrooms: A Function of Selected Learning Conditions." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1975.

California State Department of Education. Handbook on Continuing Education. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1964.

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1963.

Canfield, Jack, and Harold C. Wells. One Hundred Ways to Enhance Self-Concept in the Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers and Parents. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Carney, R. E. Initial Report on the Risk Taking Attitude Questionnaire and Behavior-Values Inventory to Evaluate a Drug-Abuse Prevention Program in Tempe, Arizona. Schools, Tempe, Arizona: Tempe School District No. 3, 1972.

_____. An Evaluation of the Tempe, Arizona, 1970-71 Drug-Abuse Prevention Education Program Using RTAQ and B-VI Final Report, Tempe, Arizona: Tempe School District No. 3, 1972.

Clark, Kenneth, and Alex C. Sherriffs. How Relevant Is Education in America Today? Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1970.

Colquit, Jesse L. "To Facilitate Their Quest for Identity--Eliminating Black Cultural Oppression in the School Curriculum." The Education Digest, March, 1975, XLII: 7, pp. 20-27.

Combs, A. W., and D. W. Saper. "The South, Its Derivative Terms and Research." Journal of Individual Psychology, 13:134-45, 1957.

Davis, Jim R. "Missouri Social Studies Teachers' Commitment to Transmit Selected Social Values." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1976.

Dent, Preston L. "The Curriculum as a Prejudice Reduction Technique." California Journal of Educational Research, XXVI:167-177.

Deutsch, M. "Conflicts: Productive and Destructive." Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, pp. 7-41.

Doll, Ronald. Curriculum Improvement: Decision-Making and Process. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.

Dukes, W. O. "Psychological Studies of Values." Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, pp. 24-50.

Fantini, Mario, and Gerald Weinstein. Toward a Contact Curriculum. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith, 1972.

Feldman, S. N. "The Relationship Between Open and Closed Belief Systems and Accuracy and Affect in Interpersonal Perception." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962.

Fitts, W. H. "Manual: Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, Nashville, Tennessee." Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Gage, M. L. (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Galbraith, Donald, and Thomas M. Jones. Moral Reasoning: A Teaching Handbook for Adapting Kohlberg to the Classroom. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Greenhaven Press, Inc., 1976.

Gay, Geneva, and James A. Banks. "Teaching the American Revolution: A Multiethnic Approach." Social Education, November/December, 1975, pp. 461-465.

Glock, Charles Y., Robert Wuthnow, Jane Allyn Piliavin, and Metta Spencer. Adolescent Prejudice. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Grant, Carl A. "A Carrot in a Pot of Water is Not Vegetable Soup: Racism in School and Society." Educational Leadership, December, 1975, pp. 184-188.

Hennessey, James J., and Phillip R. Merrifield. "Ethnicity and Sex Distinctions in Patterns of Aptitude Factor Scores in a Sample of Urban High School Seniors." American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15, 3, pp. 385-389.

Hough, J. B., and E. J. Amidon. Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1967.

Howe, F. C. "Teacher Perceptions Toward the Learning Ability of Students from Different Racial and Socio-Economic Backgrounds." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Michigan State University, 1971.

Howe, Leland, and Mary M. Howe. Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond. New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc., 1975.

Isaac, Stephen, and William B. Michael. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: EDITS, 1971.

Jeffcoate, Rob. "Schools and Prejudice." Trends in Education. September, 1975, 3:3-9.

Jersild, A. T. In Search of Self. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.

Johnston, William W. "Dogmatism as a Means of Predicting Insecurity, Self-Concept, Meaning, Attitudes, and Effectiveness of Female Elementary Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1969.

Katin, S. "The Relationship Between Professed Values and Emotional Adjustment of College Students." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1969.

Katz, Michael B. Bureaucracy and Schools, The Illusion of Educational Change in American. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.

Kemp, C. G. "Effects of Dogmatism on Critical Thinking." School Science and Mathematics, 34:314-19, 1960.

Klevan, Alber. "An Investigation of a Methodology for Values Clarification: Its Relationship to Consistency In Thinking, Purposefulness, and Human Relations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1957.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. (Set of Study Cards) What Do You Values? Minneapolis: Greenhaven Press, 1978.

_____. "The Child as a Moral Philosopher." Psychology Today, Vol. 2, No. 4, September, 1978.

_____, and Phillip Whitten. "Understanding the Hidden Curriculum." Learning Magazine, Vol. 1, No. 2, December, 1972.

Lafferty, James C. "A Study of Changes in Self-Concepts of Teachers Following Participation in a Consulting Mental Health Program." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1961.

Lasswell, Harold. University in Perspective, Proceedings of the American Society of International Law, 1959.

Latimer, Bettye I. "Telegraphing Messages to Children About Minorities." The Reading Teacher, November, pp. 151-156.

Lessing, Elise E., and Chester C. Clarke. "An Attempt to Reduce Ethnic Prejudice and Assess its Correlates in a Junior High School Sample." Educational Research Quarterly, Summer, 1976, 1:3, pp. 3-16.

Leviatin, Victor. Resource Unit on Race, Prejudice and Discrimination. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith, 1971.

Lewis, C. L. "Ethnic and Social Class Differences in Values Related to Effective Coping Behavior." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1969.

Lewin, K. "Environmental Forces in Child Development and Behavior." in C. Murchison (Ed.), A Handbook of Child Psychology, Worcestor, Massachusetts: Clark University Press, 1961.

McNamara, R. J. "The Effects of Subject Matter Knowledge and Certain Selected Attitudes Upon the Use of Verbal Behaviors of Secondary Education Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1969.

Maslow, Abraham. Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1968.

May, Rollo. "Freedom and Responsibility Reexamined" in Esther Lloyd-Jones and Westervelt (Eds.), Behavioral Sciences and Guidance: Proposal and Perspectives. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Moroney, L. "Methods of Studying Self-Concepts of Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1958.

National Council for Education Statistics, Education Division, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "The Condition of Education: A Statistical Report on the Condition of American Education, 1975." Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1975, p. 71.

Nie, Norman H., Hull, et al. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Second Edition, McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Noar, Gertrude. Sensitizing Teachers to Ethnic Groups. New York: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1968.

_____. Prejudice and Discrimination: A Resource Unit for Teachers and Group Leaders. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith, 1967.

Perkins, J. T. "Research Relating to the Problems of Values." California Journal of Secondary Education, 1954, 23, pp. 223-242.

Peterson, J. A. Counseling and Values. Scranton: International Textbook Company, 1970.

Public Law 88-352, Title 28, Sections 1971, 1975a-d, 2000a-h, and Public Law 89-10, Title 20, Sections 241a, 241aa, 331, 868, 880, 887, and 900.

Rankin, R. E., and D. T. Campbell. "Galvanic Skin Response to Negro and White Experiments." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1955, 51:30-33.

Raths, James. "An Application of Clarifying Techniques to Academic Underachievers in High School." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1960.

Raths, Louis, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney Simon. Values and Teaching. Columbus, Ohio: Charles B. Merrill Publishing Company, 1966.

Reilly, Mary E. "Eliminating Sexism: A Challenge to Educators." Social Education, 1979, 43, 4, pp. 312-316.

Riles, Wilson. Statement to all California School Districts, Sacramento, California State Department of Education, 1975, pp. 1-2.

Rivlin, Harry, and Milton Gold. Teachers for Multicultural Education. New York: Fordham University Teachers Corps.

Rogers, Carl. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

Rogers, Carl. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.

Rogers, Carl. "Toward a Modern Approach to Values: The Valuing Process in the Mature Person." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, pp. 165-66.

Rosenthal, D. "Changes in the Moral Values Following Psycho-Therapy." Journal of Consulting Psycho-Therapy, 19: 431-33, 1955.

Rucker, W. Roy. Human Values in Education. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1969.

Ryst, Ray C. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 40, No. 3, August, 1970.

Shaver, James P., President, National Council for the Social Studies, James A. Banks, Carlos E. Cortes, Geneva Gay, Ricardo L. Garcia and Anna S. Ochoa (Eds.) Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education, Arlington, Virginia: The Council, 1976.

Seidman, D. L. "The Self-Concept of Elementary School Student Teachers and Its Relationship to Classroom Verbal Interaction." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1969.

Sidney, Elayne. Values. Carson City, California: Educational Insights, 1977.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

Simon, Sidney B. "Values Clarification: Methodology and Tests of a Hypothesis in an Inservice Program Relating to Behavior Changes in Secondary School Students." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1958.

_____., Leland Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum. Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students. Hart Publishing Company, New York, 1972.

Simon, Sidney. (Set of Study Cards). "What Do You Value?" Minneapolis: Greenhaven Press, 1978.

Smith, M. Brewster, and Jane Allyn Piliavin. The Schools and Prejudice: Findings. New York: Praeger Publishing Company, 1969.

Stent, Madelon, William R. Hazard, and Harry N. Rivlin. Cultural Pluralism in Education: A Mandate for Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973.

Strider, Fred D. "Self-Concept Factors Affecting the Judgments of Others." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1961.

Tice, Terrence N. "Multicultural Objectives: A Critical Approach." Teaching in a Multicultural Society, New York Free Press, 1977.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Teachers and Students, Report V: Mexican American Education Study, Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, March, 1973.

Vallutino, Frank. "Decision-Making as a Function of Self-Concept." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1964.

Washburn, David. Multicultural Education Programs, Ethnic Studies Curricula, and Ethnic Studies Materials in the United States Public Schools, Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania: Department of Educational Studies and Services, Bloomsburg State College.

Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Wrenn, S. C. "The Self-Concept in Counseling." Journal of Counselor Psychology, 5:104-109, 1958.

Wylie, Ruth C. The Self-Concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

Davis, Jim R. Lecture and Other Information from Workshop "Multicultural Education," Northern Arizona University, Second Summer Session, 1978.

APPENDIX A

MULTICULTURAL STUDENT SURVEY

MULTICULTURAL STUDENT SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE STUDENT: (Teacher Read Aloud to Class)

We are very interested in getting your honest reactions to the survey below. Please mark only on the answer sheet in front of you. This is not a test, so please do not put your name on the answer sheet. All we want you to do is be as truthful as you possibly can in answering the question, or completing the statements. Please use a number 2 black pencil only. Make heavy black marks that fill the circle completely. Erase clearly any answer you wish to change, and do not make any other marks on the answer sheet.

Now look at your answer sheet and make sure that the words "GENERAL PURPOSE NCS - ANSWER SHEET" are facing you. The first four answers we will all do together. Answers 5 through 26 you will do yourself.

Are there any questions? (Teacher answer questions)

Number 1 - My sex is:

(A) Male (B) Female (Teacher, please check to see if students place their answers in the correct bubble.)

Number 2 - My age is:

(A) 11 years
(B) 12 years
(C) 13 years
(D) 14 years
(E) 15 years (Teacher please check)

Number 3 - My ethnic background is:

(A) White American, Anglo (Irish, Italian, German, Dutch, French, Polish, Norwegian, Swedish, Swiss, British, English, Scotch, Other White American)

(B) Black American (African, Afro-American)

(C) Asian American (Japanese, Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, Laotian, Tai, Korean, Cambodian, Other Asian American

(D) None of the above (Go to number 4)

Number 4 - My ethnic background is: (If you answered "D" in number 3 above, please answer this item. Otherwise, you do not have to answer this item.) (Teacher please check)

(A)	Mexican	
(B)	Mexican American	
(C)	Chicano	
(D)	Other Latino	(Puerto Rican, Cuban, Costa Rican, Spanish, Panamanian, Other Latino)
(E)	Native American	(All Nations)

TEACHER: Now you may go on to item number 5, and complete all the items yourself. Remember, answer as honestly as you can. By doing so, we will be able to improve programs in this school. After you complete the survey, turn your answer sheet over and put your pencil down.

READY, BEGIN

5. I am sure of my ethnic background.

   (A) Yes (B) No (C) Don't know (D) Don't care

6. It is important for me to know about my cultural background.

   (A) Yes (B) No (C) Not sure (D) Don't care

7. It is important to me that others know about my cultural background.

   (A) Yes (B) No (C) Not sure (D) Don't care

8. It is important to me that I know about other people's background.

   (A) Yes (B) No (C) Not sure (D) Don't care

9. When I meet a person who is Black, I feel that he/she is:

   (A) Better than me
   (B) Equal to me
   (C) Not as good as me
   (D) Don't know

10. The word prejudice means:

   (A) When people judge me before they know me
   (B) When people do not like me because of something I have done
   (C) When people look different
   (D) Don't know

11. The word stereotyping means:

   (A) When people make a general statement about a group of people
   (B) When people say they don't care about me
   (C) When people see me as being a valuable person
   (D) Don't know

12. When I meet a person who is Mexican, I feel that he/she is:

(A) Better than me
(B) Equal to me
(C) Not as good as me
(D) Don't know

13. When I really get very upset with somebody:

(A) I want to talk to him/her about it
(B) I want to hit him/her
(C) I don't speak to him or her anymore
(D) I don't know what to do

14. Which of the names of the following United States citizens are considered "real" Americans?

(A) Stanislaus Stokowski
(B) Kim Yee
(C) John Smith
(D) All of the above

15. When I meet a person for the first time and he/she speaks English with an accent, I feel that person:

(A) Probably speaks another language
(B) Is not as smart as I
(C) Does not speak English well
(D) Don't know

16. When I meet a person who is white, I feel that he/she is:

(A) Better than me
(B) Equal to me
(C) Not as good as me
(D) Don't know

17. When I meet a person who speaks a language other than English, I feel that person:

(A) Bothers me
(B) Is not an American
(C) Has a right to speak another language
(D) Don't know

18. Having boys and girls together in P.E. classes:

(A) Helps us see each other as equals
(B) Helps us see that girls are better than boys
(C) Helps us see that boys are better than girls
(D) Don't know

19. Most of the time, I see my classroom assignments as being:

(A) Meaningful to me
(B) Not meaningful
(C) Neither meaningful nor not meaningful
(D) Don't know

20. In classroom discussion:

(A) I participate all the time
(B) I participate only when asked
(C) I don't like to participate, but I do
(D) I don't participate

21. The materials (books, posters, films or movies) that we use in all my classrooms:

(A) Often tell about my ethnic background
(B) Sometimes tell about my ethnic background
(C) Never tell about my ethnic background
(D) Don't know

22. When I meet very old people, I feel that he/she is:

(A) Better than me
(B) Equal to me
(C) Due special treatment
(D) Not as good as me

23. When I meet a person who is an Asian, I feel that he/she is:

(A) Better than me
(B) Equal to me
(C) Not as good as me
(D) Don't know

24. I find most of my teachers to be:

(A) Very concerned and understanding
(B) Somewhat concerned and understanding
(C) A little concerned and understanding
(D) Not concerned and not understanding

25. When I meet a person who is different from me, I feel that he/she is:

(A) Better than me
(B) Equal to me
(C) Not as good as me
(D) Don't know

26. The materials (posters, books, films, movies) we use in the classroom:

(A) Talk equally about boys and girls
(B) Talk mostly about boys
(C) Talk mostly about girls
(D) Don't know

27. Presentations and discussions in all my classrooms:

(A) Often tell about my ethnic background
(B) Sometimes tell about my ethnic background
(C) Never tell about my ethnic background
(D) Don't know

28. I feel that most of the teachers at this school:

(A) Treat all of us fairly
(B) Favor the minority students
(C) Favor the non-minority students
(D) Don't know

29. When I meet a person who is a Filipino, I feel that he/she is:

(A) Better than me
(B) Equal to me
(C) Not as good as me
(D) Don't know

30. My best friends are:

(A) From my own ethnic group
(B) From different ethnic groups
(C) Ethnic background is not the basis for choice of friends
(D) Don't know

31. When I meet a person who is racially different from me, I feel:

(A) Frightened
(B) Comfortable
(C) Uncomfortable
(D) Don't know

32. In this school, I feel that:

(A) None of my teachers like me
(B) All of my teachers like me
(C) Most of my teachers like me
(D) Don't know

33. When I meet a person who is blind, I feel that he/she is:

(A) Better than me
(B) Equal to me
(C) Not as good as me
(D) Don't know

34. Which of the names of the following United States citizens are considered "real" Americans?

(A) Imani Zote
(B) Carlos Gomez
(C) Mike Jones
(D) All of the above

35. Integration of the schools will be:

(A) Beneficial to all students
(B) Will not be beneficial to all students
(C) Will be beneficial to minority students only
(D) Don't know

(You are now finished. Please put your pencil down and turn your answer sheet over. Thank you.)

APPENDIX B

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR THE MULTICULTURAL STUDENT SURVEY

Reliability Coefficients for the Multicultural Student Survey

Item	Coefficient
5	.49
6	.61
7	.65
8	.53
9	.68
10	.64
11	.53
12	.61
13	.57
14	.69
15	.69
16	.64
17	.82
18	.56
19	.52
20	.75
21	.73
22	.69
23	.59
24	.51
25	.80
26	.78
27	.83
28	.74
29	.83
30	.68
31	.75
32	.78
33	.68
34	.60
35	.60

APPENDIX C

MULTICULTURAL OBJECTIVES

MULTICULTURAL OBJECTIVES LIKELY TO INFLUENCE POSITIVE MULTICULTURAL PRESS

Knowledge

Students will acquire knowledge about:

1. The contributions of Asian, Black, Hispanic, and Native Americans to United States Society.

2. The political, economical, and social conditions, past and present, which contribute to the inequities experienced by Asian, Black, Hispanic, and Native Americans in the United States.

3. The similarities in personal experiences (e.g., problems, aspirations, concerns, customs, lifestyle, etc.) of people in the United States who are diverse in racial, socio-economic, ethnic, religious, or other ways.

4. The causes and consequences of considering people inferior, unacceptable, and/or undesirable because they are culturally different from oneself.

5. Values, customs, and lifestyles in contemporary society associated with different groups (i.e., religious, socio-economic, ethnic, racial).

6. The combination of fact, myth, legend in most history texts.

7. Poverty and institutional racism as they have existed and exist in United States society.

8. How personal perception influences communication with others.

9. Factors which cause social rejection to be a problem experienced by many people, especially Asian, Black, Hispanic, and Native Americans.

10. The difference between what people of diverse cultural groups learn and what they inherit.

Skills

Student will develop skill in:

11. Working as a member of groups, which have a focus on solving problems <u>together</u>.

12. Avoiding stereotypic thinking.

13. Resolving interpersonal conflicts which occur in the classroom.

14. Analyzing the causes of conflicts between individuals or groups.

15. Approaching in an objective way any problems of conflict being studied or being experienced in school.

16. Identifying what actions they can take to have some impact on a given problem studied in class, and then performing some of those actions.

17. Identifying their own values and other value positions related to a specific issue or problem.

18. Attempting to resolve intergroup tension in the classroom.

19. Self-assessing personal attitudes toward culturally different individuals.

20. Attentive listening.

21. Exploring what others means by what they say or do (verbally or nonverbally)

22. Recognizing the relationship between one's feelings, one's behavior, and one's relationship with others.

23. Attempting to determine how their behavior affects others.

24. Examining their personal assumptions about the motives of others, and testing with others whether those assumptions are correct.

Attitudes

Students will:

25. Begin to understand and respect the human differences between people of the same cultural group as well as understand and respect the human differences which distinguish groups from each other.

26. Begin to develop a belief in the value of positive interaction by all cultural groups, based on mutual respect.

27. Begin to appreciate the value of cultural diversity in the United States.

28. Begin to develop a sense of responsibility for making personal efforts to have some impact on conflict between individuals or groups (1975:64-66).

APPENDIX D

PILOT STUDY: "MEETSS - MULTIETHNIC EDUCATION ENRICHES THE SOCIAL SCIENCES"

PILOT STUDY: "MEETSS - MULTIETHNIC EDUCATION ENRICHES THE SOCIAL SCIENCES"

Procedures Used

Time Line for Inservice:

Wednesday, February 1, 1978

Multicultural Environment Survey administered to participants. This instrument was designed by Dr. John Browne.

Thursday, February 2, 1978

3:30-6:30 Orientation to "MEETSS"

Consultants: Dr. John Browne, Multiethnic Education Coordinator, San Diego County Department of Education; Mr. James Rogers, Social Studies Coordinator, San Diego County Department of Education.

Panel: Rosalia Salinas, Bilingual-bicultural Coordinator, San Diego Department of Education; Tets Kirshma, Instructor, San Diego Unified School District; Starla Hollins, Afro-American and Afrikan Studies Department, Palomar College.

Saturday, February 11, 1978

7:30 A.M. - Registration
8:00-6:00 - Workshop
Lunch - "An Afrikan Experience"

Values Education Workshop

Consultant: Dr. Jim Davis, Multiethnic Education/ Social Sciences, Northern Arizona University.

Food prepared by Workshop Leader.

Thursday, February 16, 1978

3:30-6:30 Understanding and Teaching the Culturally Different Student

Focus: The Mexican American Student in San Diego County

Consultant: Rosalia Salinas, Bilingual/bicultural Coordinator, San Diego Department of Education.

Thursday, February 23, 1978

3:30-6:30 Understanding and Teaching the Culturally Different Student

Focus: The Asian American Student in San Diego County

Consultant: Tets Krishma, Science Teacher, San Diego High School, San Diego Unified School District.

Thursday, March 2, 1978

3:30-6:30 Understanding and Teaching the Culturally Different Student

Focus: The Afrikan American Student in San Diego County

Consultant: Starla Hollins, Instructor, Afro-American and Afrika Studies Department, Palomar College

Thursday, March 9, 1978

3:30-6:30 Development of MEETSS Teaching Units by Participants

Field testing of Multicultural Student Survey by the participants at their respective school sites.

Thursday, March 16, 1978

3:30-6:30 Progress Reports by Participants

Focus: Examination of field test results of Multicultural Student Survey. Rewriting of Multicultural Student Survey by participants and consultants.

Consultants: Bill Wappes, District Social Science Chairperson; Nena Ratermanis, District Multicultural Specialist.

Thursday, April 13, 1978

3:30-6:30 Sharing of Units and Teaching Strategies Developed by Participants

Practicum: Selecting, Evaluating, and Revising Multiethnic Materials

Consultant: Dr. John Browne, Multiethnic Education Coordinator, San Diego Department of Education.

Thursday, May 11, 1978

3:30-6:30 Report - Need for District Assessment of Multicultural Attitudes of Students: Item Analysis of Multicultural Student Survey

Consultant: Mrs. Nena Ratermanis, Multicultural Specialist, Sweetwater Union High School District

Thursday, May 18, 1978

3:30-6:30 Assessment of Students by Participants

Multicultural Student Survey

Thursday, June 1, 1978

3:30-6:30 Evaluation of Multicultural Survey Results as Reported to the District Office by Data Processing

Consultant: Mrs. Nena Ratermanis, District Multicultural Specialist

Thursday, June 8, 1978

3:30-6:30 Wrapup of Pilot Study; Final Evaluation

Consultant: Workshop Leader, Louise Dunbar

Evaluation

One semester was not enough time for a project of this nature. The participants should have been inserviced for one full semester prior to the development of the multiethnic teaching units, program, and student survey. One technique, "values clarification," as opposed to many techniques, should have been the thrust of the inservice program.

The (inservice) pilot study was worthy of district-wide implementation because the District Social Science Chairperson and the District Multicultural Education Committee met March 1, 1978, in an attempt to set up guidelines for the development of a Multicultural Education Curriculum in the social sciences at the junior high school level for 1978-79 based on the proposal that resulted in "MEETSS" being funded.

Finally, such a program was implemented at the junior high level in September, for 1978-79 school year.

1. Twelve out of 18 participants completed the course for four units of credit.
2. Each participant (100 percent) stated that (s)he would continue in the program if it is offered in 1978-79.
3. Each participant stated that the course had been worthwhile.
4. Each participant stated that (s)he had done more work in this course than in any workshop or inservice that (s)he had taken before.
5. Each participant developed a multicultural teaching unit. Due to the time factor, these units were not published.
6. Each participant stated that the fear of trying new techniques has been greatly reduced as a result of this workshop.
7. Each participant stated that (s)he felt comfortable in using "values clarification" as a multicultural education teaching strategy.
8. Each participant stated that their ability to clarify and analyze their own personal feelings, attitudes, and perceptions

toward their own and other ethnic groups had increased significantly.

9. Each participant stated that his/her awareness of the prejudices of students against
   a. older people
   b. different ethnic groups
   c. women
   d. handicapped persons

   had been made clearer. However, five participants felt that more inservice was needed in order to more fully understand how to help students reduce many of these personal prejudices.
10. The Multicultural Student Survey was developed and implemented as a part of the District's Multicultural/Bicultural Education Program.
11. Two other school districts requested permission to use the Multicultural Student Survey.

APPENDIX E

TREATMENT

TREATMENT

The treatment was conducted weekly by this researcher. Usually, the regular teacher was not present during this time. Each week a different activity was introduced to the experimental classes; each class period was 42 minutes. Listed below is the treatment that covered 19 weeks, commencing October 9, 1978, and terminating March 16, 1979.

October 9-13 Pretesting Experimental Group - 163 subjects
Pretesting Control Group - 132 subjects
Total - 295 subjects

October 16-20 Introduction to Values Clarification

a. Study Questions - What are "values?" How do we develop values? What are morals? What is the difference between moral laws and man-made laws?

b. Completion of three quick worksheets from Values. (Values is a workbook of cartoon settings which allow students "to get into the picture" and write their own choices and opinions.)

October 25-27 Follow-Up to Introduction to Values Clarification

Topics for Discussion

a. What are values? How do values help us in our daily lives? Why do people have

different values? What does the statement, "Different is different--not good or bad--but different" mean to you? What happens when you have values conflicts with your (1) peers; (2) parents; (3) siblings; (4) teachers; (5) classmates; (6) or other people?

b. Class discussion on worksheets from previous week. Students had to rank 1-15, 15 items that they would take from their burning house. Student had to complete various value statements on two worksheets.

October 30-31; November 1-3 Value-Clarifying Strategies

"Things I Love to Do" and "I Learned that I. . ." (Both activities are an approach to help students learn a process for the clarification of their own values.) (Howe, 1975)

November 6-10 Value-Clarifying Strategies

"Baker's Dozen" (Teaches students about their personal priorities). "I Learned that I. . ." (way of getting the students to own the process of the search for values). (Howe, 1975)

November 15-17 Minimum Days - Role-Playing Activities for 20 Minutes

November 20-22 Value-Clarifying Strategies

"I Urge" Telegrams (helps students to find out what they really want; also aids in discussing alternative ways of getting things done). (Davis, Workshop)

Related Group Activity - "The Alligator River Story"

November 27-30 Value-Clarifying Strategies

December 1 "Personal Coat of Arms" (Designed to help students learn more about some of our most strongly held values and to learn the importance of publicly affirming what we believe). (Howe, 1975)

"Dear Abby" (Students all created problems or value dilemmas for "Dear Abby." These are written on index cards and "mailed" to Dear Abby.) (Howe, 1975)

December 4-8 From previous week - "Dear Abby" cards are drawn from "mailbox" by students and read aloud. Students offer solutions to these value dilemmas.

Students enjoyed this activity so much that it was repeated during this class period.

December 11-15 Values

Cartoon settings which allow students "to get into the picture" and write their own choices and opinions. (Sidney, 1977)

January 2-5 Introduction - Discussion Kits on Meaning and Values

Photo Study Cards - Opposing Viewpoints (Kohlberg and Simon, 1978)

Series (Complete with Teacher's Guide and instructions for all activities on the back of every card).

a. Front side presents value conflict through dramatic photos (stresses Simon's approach dealing with affective behavior--clarifying values, feelings, and attitudes).

b. Back side presents discussion activities that ask students to make difficult moral judgments (stresses Kohlberg's approach dealing with cognitive conflict and moral reasoning).

January 8-12 Who Are You?

Activity correlates the six possible responses in every moral dilemma with Kohlberg's six stages of moral reasoning; Simon's values clarification also.

January 15-19 Who Would You Like to Be?

Front side clarifying values, feelings, and attitudes

Back side Kohlberg's six stages of moral reasoning

January 22-27	<u>What Do You Value?</u> Kohlberg's six stages of moral reasoning; Simon's clarifying values, feelings, and attitudes
January 29-31; February 1-2	<u>You and Authority</u> Moral reasoning vs. values clarification
February 13-16	"The Prejudice Film" What does the "prejudice" mean? How does one become prejudiced? Is there a relationship between "fear" and "prejudice?"
February 20-23; Feburary 26-28; March 1-2	"Stereotyping" Class discussion on filmstrip "Master Race Myth" Class discussion on film strip These color sound film strips probe the workings of prejudice; what it is, how it grows, how it is mutually destructive to all concerned, and how it can be eradicated. Stresses the importance of facts and shows that prejudice has no basis in fact. a. Part I - "Stereotyping" b. Part II - "Master Race Myth"
March 5-9	Wrapup of Values Clarification Activities
March 12-16	Posttest of Experimental Group (121 subjects) Posttest of Control Group (171 subjects) Total - 292 subjects